





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

✓



John G. Talbot
A ————— Dec. 1864.

CHARGE

TO THE CLERGY AND CHURCHWARDENS

OF THE

DIOCESE OF SALISBURY,

AT HIS TRIENNIAL VISITATION,

IN AUGUST, 1864.

BY WALTER KERR,

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

SALISBURY :
BROWN AND CO., CANAL.

LONDON : RIVINGTONS. OXFORD : PARKER.

SALISBURY:
BENNETT, PRINTER,
JOURNAL OFFICE.

TO THE
CLERGY AND THE CHURCHWARDENS
OF THE
DIOCESE OF SALISBURY,
THIS CHARGE
IS AFFECTIONATELY AND RESPECTFULLY
DEDICATED,
BY THEIR FAITHFUL FRIEND AND SERVANT,
W. K. SARUM.

PALACE, SALISBURY.
August, 1864.

UNIVERSITY
MANAGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS.



	PAGE.
This Visitation	7
Diocese—State of	10
Diocese—Changes in	10
Poor Benefice Augmentation Fund	14
Faithfulness of Clergy	16
Bishop's Duty with regard to the Discipline of the Clergy	17
Real Question at Issue	19
The Denial of the Supernatural	20
How such an Opinion gained acceptance	23
What done to defend the Faith	25
My Own Conduct	28
Its Result	29
Process by which Result was reached	30
Remedy of Present Grievance of the Church	31
Relations of Church and State	33
Re-union of Christendom	42
Diocesan Synods	47
Our Faith not a Matter of Opinion or Sentiment	49
The Creeds	51
The Formularies are Dogmatic	55
Theological College	58
Retreats	59
Sermons	63
Missions	66
Bishop of Capetown	68
Pastoral Letters	69
The Holy Sacraments	73
The Order for the Burial of the Dead	75
Subscription	80
Book of Common Prayer	81
Act of Uniformity	82
Our Special Circumstances	83
How the Clergy should Exercise their Ministry	86

APPENDIX.

	PAGE
Tabular Statement of Services, &c. &c.	92
Pastoral Letters	...
Training School Statistics	...
Missions	...
Parish Schools	...
Churches Consecrated and Restored, &c.	...
Result of Inspection of Schools	...
Names and Benefices of Clergy who have died	...
Diocesan School Prize Scheme	...
Extract from Last Charge	...
Answer to Address of Dorset Clergy	...
Letter to the Archdeacons	...
Mission House Statistics	...
Letter from Rev. Prebendary Payne	...

C H A R G E,

ETC.

My REVEREND BRETHREN AND BRETHREN
OF THE LAITY,

On most of the subjects with which my Visitation is concerned, I have received all the ^{This} information which I can need. ^{Visitation.}

The answers to the questions which I addressed in the month of February to the Rural Deans and the Officiating Ministers of the Diocese have given me very many details of the state of that part of our Church of which I am the Overseer.

The declarations made by the Churchwardens and Sidesmen are no less satisfactory, except in the case of those articles of visitation and inquiry which regard the morals of their fellow parishioners.

In these excepted and most important particulars, the Presentments are not always, I am well aware, a full representation of all the facts of the case.

But it could not, under present circumstances, have been otherwise.

Not only is there at present no attempt in our Church to exercise discipline, but the very idea of discipline, as an appointment of our Lord, seems to

have almost lost its place in our religious system; and this being so I am not surprised that the Churchwardens and Sidesmen have not satisfied the demands which are made upon them at the time of their Bishop's Visitation for a report on these matters.

I am not however on this account prepared to expunge these two Articles of Inquiry;^a for though we have been for some time under the necessity of foregoing the ancient discipline, my own wishes and hopes remain in entire accordance with the language of our Church on this subject; and I look to and desire the coming of the time when “faith in the reality and grievous effect of excommunication” will have been thus far restored, as to make it possible so to use Church Courts and Church Laws that “persons convicted of notorious sin may be put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls may be saved in the day of the Lord.”^b

In the meanwhile, the Church must exercise the disciplinary and penitential power which our Lord has entrusted to her in the best way that circumstances will permit, and the Bishops must at their Visitations be content to receive a declaration from the Churchwardens and Sidesmen which does not represent a perfect discharge of their duties.

And this admission of failure—necessary failure—in one special branch of my inquiries, is only part of a more general admission which I am prepared to

^a Keble's Life of Bishop Wilson, vol. i., p. 202.

^b Commination Service,

make—namely, that Visitations, as far as the Clergy are concerned, have not the same influence which they once had in the effective administration of the Church of God. We must however thankfully retain and use them, as means of great indirect good, as acts of Church administration, which bear on them the mark of time-honoured sanction, and as instruments which may in contingencies possibly not very distant be employed with the important results which attended them in former days.

In the meantime, some desirable changes may be made in the conduct of them, and on the present occasion I have, with a view to the convenience of the Clergy and Laity, made some new arrangements both for the discharge of my duties as Visitor, and for the celebration of the religious Offices which initiate them.

Thus the celebration of Holy Communion is now separated from the Morning Prayer, and I have fixed the hour for calling over the names of the Clergy in my Court, and for addressing to them and the Churchwardens my Charge.

I have also requested my Clergy to give notice in their churches of these appointments, as I was advised on the occasion of my last visitation, that there were persons (as was most natural) who would have been thankful to join with their Bishop and Clergy in the religious Offices of the day, but who were unwilling to do so without some expression of welcome from me.

The only other departure from my custom at my

three former Visitations will be found in my Charge. I have always tried to keep clearly before my mind the distinction between a Synod and a Visitation, and so have abstained from seeming to assume to myself the right of speaking in my Court as *ex cathedrâ* on points on which I might only rightly so speak in Synod.

I have accordingly on these former occasions ^{Diocese.—} occupied your time mainly with such a ^{State of.} review of Diocesan and Church work, as your answers to my questions, and my own experience enabled me to give you. And though I hope not to transgress to-day the limits which I have hitherto fixed for myself, I shall, with regard to the state of my Diocese, content myself with simply assuring you that, as far as I can rely on outward tokens, we have on the whole cause to thank God, and with thankful hearts to strive the more earnestly and hopefully to prepare ourselves and those committed to us for the account of the Great Day.

And in giving you this assurance, both I who bear ^{Changes in} this witness, and you who hear it, must at ^{Diocese.} this moment have present to our minds that in God's good Providence many of our brethren have been withdrawn from their service in the Church in this Diocese since my last Visitation.

At that exact time, our hearts were sorely tried by the death of a layman, who, by his almsdeeds, and other good works—by his ever ready sympathy with everything that is lovely and of good report—

cheered on my Clergy and myself, to attempt an imitation of that unselfish, elastic, hopeful, unflagging devotion to duty, which characterised the late Lord Herbert.

But this was but the beginning of the changes which have since come upon us. Look only, my brethren, to a few of those which have taken place amongst the Clergy.^a

One part of my Diocese, Dorsetshire, has lost the services of two Archdeacons—of one, whose long experience, knowledge of Ecclesiastical law, courteous bearing, and particularly his able, vigorous charges, full of research, and important information, gave a special value to his ministrations; and of another, who was welcomed by the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese, as the natural successor to Archdeacon Buckle, but who, after having by his first most remarkable and valuable Charge confirmed the wisdom of my choice, and the justice of his brethren's anticipations, was obliged on the ground of health to tender his resignation of an office of so much responsibility.

In the Archdeaconry of Wilts, the losses have been still more severe, for the changes have been there caused by death.

By the death of that aged servant of the Lord, Archdeacon Macdonald, the Archdeaconry was deprived of the guidance of one, who, by his prudence, integrity, strong common sense, kindness of heart,

^a See Appendix, p. 91.

and long-sustained loyalty to the Church, had gained and maintained the confidence of the Clergy and Laity in his Archdeaconry, and especially (as I am often told) of that most influential and attached body of Churchmen, the Yeomen of Wiltshire.

On the occasion of his death, there was in that Archdeaconry, as in the Archdeaconry of Dorset, one man marked out, I rejoiced to know as his successor by the wishes and judgment of all its members, whether lay or clerical. This was Henry Drury, who had been associated with me as Examining Chaplain to my revered predecessor, and to whom I was united, not only by an unvarying appreciation of the refinement, gentleness, and vigour of his mind, the unswerving constancy of his religious principles, and the power and grasp of his sympathies, but by an intense affection which we entirely shared for our common friend and patron, the late Bishop of Salisbury.

You know, my Brethren, the result of this appointment, and I cannot trust myself to speak of the weight of sorrow and anxiety which the death of one so dear to us all brought upon me.

I was, perhaps, more able to measure the magnitude of the loss from the fact that when this sorrow came upon me I was borne down by another most searching affliction.

One of the greatest friends of my early manhood, and for whose taste, judgment, theological instinct, and learning I had the most deferential respect and admiration—to whose example I was indebted as

words cannot tell—and to whose unvarying affection I could never appeal too much or too often, namely, William Beadon Heathcote, had died on the 21st day of the preceding August.

And in his case, as in that of Henry Drury, I feel that any words of mine must fail to do justice either to his lofty character or to my own estimate of the loss which the Church has sustained.

The words in which Archdeacon Drury described his friend Precentor Heathcote on the occasion of his death, are equally true of them both:—"It was hard to say, whether we shall remember him most for the genial warmth of his heart, or for the richness of his intellectual gifts, or for his unwavering reverence for religious truth, or for the meek-eyed integrity of his saintly life;" and I would only add to such an expression of what I am sure I may say are our own thoughts, these words of faith, and hope, and love:—"They were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided."^a

But in speaking of changes, we necessarily include not only those who have vacated their offices, whether by age, or infirmity, or death, but those also who have come into their places. And here I will not, for obvious reasons, speak directly of them, but of myself.

My wish was to appoint to these offices men sound in the faith, wholly given to the work of the ministry, and to the exercises of our Holy Religion,

^a 2 Sam. i. 23.

and who by the firmness of their principles, the moderation of their characters, their conciliatory bearing, and their seeming power to move the secret springs of men's minds and hearts, were qualified to attach others to the Church of GOD. And I feel that I have cause to thank GOD that He guided me to a right choice, and I have no fear that the successors of Archdeacon Huxtable and Archdeacon Drury will ever give you cause to question whether I acted under such guidance.

In the Appendix to my Charge (a copy of which I ^{Poor Benefice} shall send to each one of you) there will be ^{Augmentation} ^{Fund.} tables^a and other statistical information, which will enable you to test the truth of the favourable report I have made to you of my Diocese; and amongst those tables there is one to which I would specially direct your attention, as the Society to which they refer has been founded since my last Visitation. I am speaking of the tables of the Poor Benefice Augmentation Fund.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, with the view of increasing small endowments, have for some years appropriated part of their means to meet local benefactions raised for that purpose; and there are, I am sorry to say, many cases in my Diocese which urgently require such augmentation.

The following statement justifies my saying this. There are in this Diocese—

29 Benefices of between £13 and £70, gross annual value, averaging less than £55,

* See Appendix, p. 92.

40 of between £70 and £100, averaging less than £86,

56 of between £100 and £150, averaging less than £125,

55 of between £150 and £200, averaging less than £171 :

i. e., there are 180 Benefices whose average gross annual value falls short of £119, and net annual value of £100, though many of them require the services of one or two Curates, and there are also about 50 incumbencies without any suitable residence.

Now, one way which has been successfully adopted in many dioceses of drawing forth a local benefaction, and so qualifying the benefice for the help of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, is by making a grant out of a common Diocesan Fund towards such local benefaction; and after a full consideration of the wants of this Diocese, and the example thus set us by others, we determined in November 1862 to form such a fund. You will see by the tables which give the amounts of our donations and subscriptions, and the collections under my Pastoral Letter what success we have had, and I trust that at our first meeting to make grants, which is fixed for Tuesday, September 27, a still stronger interest may be excited about our Association.

But in referring you to this and to the other tables which will be printed at the end of my Charge, I do not forget that in such a matter as the condition of the Church of God great caution should be used in

drawing conclusions from mere statistics. These may lead to either a too hopeful or a too unfavourable judgment. Many things must be taken into account in estimating their value, and especially in ascertaining how far they may be accepted as an answer to that question which is a most vital one to the well-being of the Church—viz., the question of the faithfulness of the Clergy.

It is this question which has, I would remind you, ^{Faithfulness} given a very special and peculiar interest ^{of Clergy.} to the controversies which had begun before my last Visitation, which are still going on, and which have not perhaps yet reached their height.

The great excitement and alarm which have attended the re-opening of old questions, and the republication of old objections to part of the teaching of the Church of Christ owed much of its impulse to the fact, that some of the leaders in these assaults on the Faith were men who had before made an explicit profession of their belief, and had entered into engagements to keep their teaching within limits, which it was felt these revived opinions had exceeded, and who upon the strength of such profession and engagements had been entrusted with the responsibilities and privileges of Office in the Church.

Many who could not appreciate the importance of the discussions which these Clergymen had raised were quite able to come to an indignant decision as to the honesty and faithfulness of those who claimed to themselves such unrestrained freedom from what were supposed to be their obligations.

With regard to my own Clergy, as a body, I have a ready and confident answer to any question which may be raised about them.

You, my Rev. Brethren, by addresses to me in 1861, and again by your addresses to me this year, and by your forward liberality in helping to relieve me from the burden of the heavy costs attendant upon my endeavours to prove that the Clergy could not claim for the errors, which some of them were propagating, the protection of the law, have as a body placed yourselves beyond the reach of suspicion about your faithfulness and honesty.

And I am the more satisfied of this, first, because usually nothing is more difficult than to obtain any united action amongst the Clergy. We are so accustomed to act as individuals (and I say this not as a matter wholly of either praise or blame), that anything like unanimity, especially when the character and interests of others are concerned, can only be the expression of a very deep and general conviction; and secondly, because there were many motives besides that of sympathy with these errors, which might have made some of you unwilling to take an active part in such measures of condemnation, however just and well considered.

And as I have referred to your readiness to show by deeds as well as words that in instituting legal proceedings I had in your judgment done what was right, I think this a natural opportunity of briefly stating what is the duty of a Bishop with respect to the discipline

Bishop's
Duty with
regard to the
Discipline of
the Clergy.

of his Clergy. This question has of late years been much discussed, but it has, perhaps, been but imperfectly understood.

The Bishop is Judge “*Ordinarius*” or Ordinary of his Diocese. He has the *cura curarum* of all souls therein, but he has also the especial duty of enquiring into and of punishing the offences of the Clerks who are placed under his control. It is necessary that he should discharge both these functions. Criminal proceedings therefore against a Clerk in Holy Orders, according to the usage of the Church, require the sanction or permission of the Bishop. It is his office, to use the proper legal term, which *is promoted*.

The Bishop proceeds against the Clerk either (1) *ex officio mero*, or (2) *ex officio promoto*.

In the former case he originates the enquiry and assigns a particular proctor or person to bring the matter legally before him in his judicial capacity, but he himself in no way interferes with the conduct of the cause.

In the latter case the Bishop does not originate the enquiry, but allows another person, who prefers the charge, to substantiate it by proper legal proceedings before him.

But any application of these principles is embarrassed by the large expenses incident to enquiry or prosecution, and by the difficulty of defraying them. It must be clear to any one who is familiar with this matter, that it is quite impossible for any Bishop, however much he may desire to be faithful, to un-

dertake the charge of correcting his Clergy by legal process, if the expenses of such process are, in every case, to fall exclusively on him.

On this point however you have anticipated my opinion by a generosity which relieves me from the necessity of saying more than that I thank you from my heart.

But the question of the faithfulness of the Clergy which has led me to make these remarks is The Real Question at Issue. not after all of such moment as the truth or falsehood of those opinions, which some of them have claimed the right of propagating.

It might have been that these Clergymen had passed the barriers within which they had solemnly engaged to the Church to exercise their functions, and that such conduct was accordingly unfaithful, but even in this case, if the barriers thus exceeded were such as to prevent them from leading forth their people to any parts of the green pastures and sweet waters of God's truth, all truth-loving men should join hand in hand to help to free them from such restraints upon the liberty of God's ministers.

But I am also satisfied of our unanimous persuasion that, should any persons desire to refer all God's dealings with man, and so those which are recorded in Holy Scripture, to the operations of some general and fixed law, which is not subject to any interference on the part of the author of such law, and so to eliminate from Holy Scripture the Supernatural, these would require not liberty but restraint.

And it is this denial of the Supernatural which ^{The Denial of the Supernatural} has been a principal cause of excitement and controversy in the Church since the year 1861. This is the root of modern scepticism, as has been most ably shown by several recent writers; this is the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, with which the faithful must do battle, if they would maintain the faith against the various errors which draw their virus more or less directly from it.

In these days attacks on the faith mainly take their rise out of this negation of God's supernatural interference. Whatever philosophical form a man's scepticism may assume, he begins and ends his assault by eliminating the Supernatural from both the moral and physical world. All consistent Rationalists alike exclude from our Holy Religion, from its history and its dogma, everything but that which may be evolved out of a sustained and unvarying process of what is called law, and they admit into their account of men and things no special expression of a Supreme and Almighty Will.

The question thus raised is, I need hardly say, most important, and may be thus stated: whether all that happens to man be not the result of certain fixed laws, which are not subject to any interference on the part of their Divine Author.

It is indeed urged that such an opinion is in harmony with the truest conception we can form of God's Almighty Power, and that in proportion as we discern more clearly this attribute of God, we shall be the less tempted to explain unusual pheno-

mena by any theory of the exercise of Supernatural Power. But it may be said, in answer to such a plea in behalf of such an elimination of the Supernatural, that belief in the being of a God involves belief in His Providence and interference—in other words, in the Supernatural.

M. Guizot^a puts this with such inimitable clearness in a work which he published last June, that I must quote his very words to you:—"Whoever really believes in God takes Providence for granted. God is not an hypothesis, put forward in order to account for the origin of things. He is not an actor, summoned on the stage of thought, merely that He may open history by the scene of the Creation, and then be dismissed to a life of uselessness and inactivity. By the mere fact of His existence, God is ever close to His handiwork, and He upholds and rules it. Providence then flows naturally and by necessity from the Being of God: it is nothing more than the constant presence and uninterrupted action of God in His own Creation."

And such an assertion may be strengthened, and the plea which it contradicts further weakened, by arguing that, though the provision and adaptation of means to an end, and the sustentation of them in an unbroken series, and the evolution through them of the most remarkable phenomena, are most evident expressions and exhibitions of Almighty Power, the interference with such a chain of causes and

^a See Appendix, p. 102.

effects, or, in other words, the interposition of some unprecedented exercise of will, is at least as clear a witness to the sovereignty of that will.

It is not however by trying to place in the balance, and to estimate by a most careful analysis the precise value either of fixed law on the one hand, or of the interference with law on the other, as indicators of the power of the agent, that we shall find the surest help in resisting the spread and establishment of the opinion in question, which gives no place to the Supernatural in the dealings of God with man. Such help is, I believe, to be obtained by a much simpler and more reliable process. We appeal against this opinion to the instinct of our common humanity. Men of all creeds, not only they who prostrate their souls when they tell out their belief in the words of the Council of Nicaea, "And was made man;" but all men who hold any "positive, practical, powerful, lasting, popular religion,"^a whatever may have been their civilization, whatever the influences of climate in forming and modifying their moral and spiritual powers, have refused to allow the system of things which we call Nature to bound their powers of vision, but have, with more or less distinctness, looked beyond it to Him who is not merely Nature personified, but Himself the Person of the Supernatural. To believe in a Supreme Being is to be prepared at any time to witness "strange"^b evidences of His Life and Presence.

Even without a revelation man feels it to be his

^a Guizot's "L'Eglise et la Société," pp. 20, 21.

^b παράδοξη, Luke v. 26.

birthright to enter into an unseen Father's presence, and when there, to claim from this Almighty Being, under certain limitations, the inclination of His will towards that of His creature.

Whatever then may be the success for a time of such an attempt to eliminate the Supernatural, it will, I am persuaded, not be able permanently to crush the natural instinct which is opposed to it, or to silence that voice of prayer which could find no utterance if man had no place in his creed for the interference of his God.

More especially as regards this latter and more interesting point—the little child, who seems to have a peculiar facility for learning to use this power—the old man—those in any adversity—those in joy and gladness—all witness to their belief that they are in this sense “fellow-workers with God,”^a and demand the removal of the barrier which the denial of the Supernatural places against the exercise of a right, which they cannot doubt is theirs.

But if we have such confidence in the power of this instinctive belief in the Supernatural, How such an opinion gained acceptance. that we believe it will in the end rise up against, master, and extrude the opinion that has for the time gained some advantage over it, the question which is so commonly asked seems only a reasonable one: how did an opinion, embarrassed by such natural and obvious disadvantages, win its way however temporarily to the assent and homage however partial of modern thought?

^a Guizot's “L'Eglise et la Société,” p. 24.

And in answer to this question I would at once say that I have no theory of the oscillation of human opinions to propound whereby to account for the promulgation and ready acceptance of this and so many affiliated errors.

Nor indeed is any such theory needed here. It is a matter of history that, long prior to that remarkable movement to which such a theory of intellectual oscillations is made to point, most unsound views, though they had not received such body as they have since acquired, were floating about the surface of society—as in the rest of Europe, so in our own country. It is within the memory of many of us, that even at Oxford, for example, there was much confusion of thought concerning the nature of good and evil, of true and false, and that many virtually denied the essential distinction between the two, while professing to find in everything a combination of both.

Such confusion tended of course to reduce everything to a mere matter of opinion, or sentiment, and to destroy belief in any fixed truth whatever.

What was then wanted was (it may be said) that intellectual or scientific exhibition of Divine truth of which it is really capable. It was for the Church to show, as she undoubtedly could show, that the Faith of which she was the expositor and guardian is a reasonable faith, as being welcome and obvious to the illuminated reason, and that the objects set before the eye of the soul—those spiritual things which must be spiritually received—are nevertheless susceptible of intellectual appreciation.

This demand was in God's good Providence to a great extent answered, and this want was for a while supplied; and I can remember the time when the intellect of Oxford, rallying round the principles and faith of the Church, seemed to have broken the power of those oppositions of science which Hegel and others had raised, and by which many men had been led almost to despair of attaining to the truth of God. But soon came a day of sad reverses, and the opinions which seemed for a while crushed regained not a little of their sway. The mind of England was again not trained to be loyal to God's Church. Liberalism in Religion—the tendency of thought to shake the basis of all *revealed* Religion, and so eventually of all Religion—the disposition to regard all religious knowledge as a matter of opinion or sentiment—again found favour with the educated classes of the country, and so, when the book entitled “Essays and Reviews” was published, the seed of its teaching was sown in ground already prepared for it. That book only expressed, and put into form, the doubts and disbelief of many, and of these—not a few, it may be feared—who had seemed at one time to have had a firm grasp of the creeds of the Church.

But though there was and is a large sceptical tendency observable in the minds and hearts of Churchmen, there also survived in them What done to defend the Faith. a larger element of strong and undoubting faith, and the question was soon put to the Bishops of the Church with a force, which made a reply unavoidable,

What can be done to stay the progress of such teaching? The disturbed and anxious convictions of both laity and clergy found utterance in warnings, that the very citadel of God's truth was in danger, and in demands that the members of the Church should all in their proper places do their duty to defend our Zion, and not allow the dictates of a worldly prudence to entail upon our children the curse of being able to claim the silence of their fathers, as an acknowledgment that opinions which, for example, eliminated the Supernatural, had a right to a place within the limits of the toleration of our Church.

There were, of course, various ways in which men, who were loyal to God's truth, might act under such circumstances. Those in authority might express their disagreement with such teaching, either singly or in combination with one another. The Clergy in convocation, or in their Archdeaconries, or in their Ruri-Decanal Chapters, or as Members of the whole Church, might fix their brand of reprobation upon it. Men of intellect and learning were bound to range their forces on the side of God's truth, and to shew that the doctrines, which had been assailed, had the sanction, not only of authority, but also of the regenerate reason of man. I say of man's reason, which, however impaired and weakened by the Fall, is restored by the incarnate Λόγος to its original capacities for investigating and recognising the highest truth. The old provision for protecting by legal proceedings and

their penal consequences the members of the Church from the false teaching of any of the Clergy, seemed still to exist. The Diocesan Courts, and the Archbishop's Court of Arches, were at any rate tribunals still in harmony with the precedents of Ecclesiastical History.

And in the defence of the truth all these means have been used. The Bishops, out of Synod, with remarkable unanimity, and the majority of both the Upper and the Lower House of Convocation, have spoken in the clearest terms in condemnation of this free handling of Holy Scripture, and answers of great intellectual value have been given to the main questions which have been raised.

If these questions were indeed such as could only be referred to the bar of the intellect, then such reference has been accepted, and answers have been given which make it the more easy to trace the finger of God's Providence in the whole controversy.

It may well have been that the eye of the Church had become dim to many of the objects which God had placed before it—that faith was not being exercised as earnestly and constantly as it should have been, and so was in a weakened state, and that thus God in mercy permitted it to be aroused and stimulated. It may have been that the very heart of the Church was becoming indifferent to the preciousness of its inheritance of truth, and required, and so received, a warning, that unless the treasure was prized and guarded, it would soon be withdrawn from it by the reckless ingenuity of irreverent thought.

And so, when it is enquired, what was the cause and origin of such an embodying of unsound views as we have witnessed within the last few years, I feel I can escape from the difficulty of giving any other or more precise answer to such an enquiry, by carrying it back to Him Who orders all things, and holds in His Almighty hands the Book of God's Sovereign Decrees.^a

Such is the account which I should from the first ^{My own} have given, and still give, of the trial ^{Conduct} through which the Church is passing.

Nor is my own conduct in this matter inconsistent with such convictions. The decrees of God do not interfere with man's responsibility as to his actions, and so when I had to decide whether I would avail myself of an instrument which God had placed in my hands, it seemed to me that it would be an act not of distrust in God's power and mercy, but of faith in the wisdom of the provisions of His providence for the preservation of the faith, that I should endeavour to arrest by process of law the progress of teaching, which in my deepest convictions I was assured had no sanction from the Church, and which teaching would, wherever appreciated and understood, weaken and even break off the communion of the soul of man with the truth of God. Of course I had to take into consideration the possible consequences of such an attempt. I had to set against the claims of my conscience urging me to shew in the use of the Courts of Law "my readiness with all faithful dili-

^a Rev. v. 1.

gence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," the various contingencies of such an appeal to law. I could not but foresee that I might become more or less responsible for a state of things, shocking to the moral sense, and weakening the foundations of ^{Its Result.} right and wrong—that state, I mean, in which we now are, when a Minister of the Church may teach for doctrines of the Church, under the protection of the law, that which the language of the Church, as interpreted by her history and her traditions, proscribes as error. Still, bad as such an issue is, and terrible as is the thought at times that I have not only been an instrument of placing the majesty of the law on the side of error, but even through the confusion which exists in men's minds between what the Church teaches and what it is not penal to teach, have been also a means of enabling men to claim for such error, however mistakenly, the authority of the Church, I am prepared to assert that my present responsibility is nothing to what it would have been, had I allowed myself, by the dread of the evil possibly resulting from legal proceedings, to be deterred from the discharge of an act of duty, which the perplexities of simple minds, the waverings of weak believers, the bolder hopes of the promoters of error called on me, in the name either of truth or of justice, to undertake. What the evil is that has come upon us, I have, in part, already reminded you. It is simply this—that a Clergyman may now teach what is contrary to the truth, in some most important

instances, with perfect immunity, so far as any legal consequences are concerned.

But this is not all. There is to my mind far greater ^{Process by which Result Reached.} evil in the constructive process by which, as it was avowed, the recent judgment was reached, than in the judgment itself. It seems to me that if a like process is to be used in future questions of heresy, no statement of doctrine, whatever the care used in the selection of words to guard the truth, can resist the ingenuity which is shewn in breaking down the strongest barriers. Words, however chosen to express and guard doctrine, whether it be, for example, the Divinity of our blessed Lord, or any other precious portion of God's truth, must crumble away under the crushing power of such a principle of construction as was applied to the word "everlasting."

Theological obligations have, indeed, hitherto held in the history of the Church a fast hold upon the minds and hearts of men, but in these latter days an authority has been claimed and used which can open a way, through all such limitations of thought, into a state of unrestricted licence.

With regard to the reasons which made it, I considered, my imperative duty to test the legality of the teaching of which I have been speaking, as I have already, in my last Charge,^a and on two other separate occasions communicated them to you, I shall not now enter into details about them. I would

only observe that, since I have known what was the process by which the final judgment was reached, I feel the more thankful that my own opinion accorded with that of a very large number of my Right Rev. Brethren as reported to me in 1862, and that I determined on the occasion of the Interlocutory Judgment not to appeal to a Court, the constitution of which I could not approve, but to be content with endeavouring to maintain the decision of the Archbishop's court.

But, further, if both the result of these legal proceedings and the process by which it was secured, cause me many anxious thoughts, I find great relief from them in the witness of the old saying, that there is no evil without a remedy.

Remedy of
Present
Grievance
of Church.

This is a statement of a truth which has a most general application, and I know not why we may not believe that it promises a remedy for our present case, which is almost that of a Church when licence is amenable only to the civil sword.

The remedy which seemed to be suggested by the Court itself, was the exercise by the Church of any powers which she might possess, and be at liberty to exercise, to guard and maintain the faith.

Now, one of these powers is the condemnation by Convocation of a book which may contain false doctrine; and you are aware that I am supported in making this assertion by the unqualified opinion given by Sir Hugh Cairns and Mr. Rolt, that Convocation is "not estopped by any statute from

expressing, by resolution or otherwise, its disapprobation or condemnation of such a book."

But such a remedy, however effective in a particular case, is in its nature, merely a special one, and the only course which could be open to the Church with a view of creating permanent restraint upon the claim for undue liberty in teaching, would be by making new Articles. But is such a remedial measure, however adequate to the character of the evil, practicable? Before we can give an answer to this question, there are others which must first be disposed of; such questions, I mean, as relate to the obstacles to be overcome before such new articles could be framed and gain authority—to the perils attendant upon such an attempt in the present divided state of Christendom, and to such facts as these, that this is not a learned, still less a theological age—that few escape the effects of the influences which disqualify for precise and scientific treatment of intellectual difficulties—that such new definitions, however perfect and authorised, would, if we may judge from the past, be in their turn subjected to processes which could entirely nullify their force, and only give men an additional stimulus to desire to be free from all engagements, as not only wrong in themselves and tyrannical, but powerless also in their hold upon the conscience.

And when we have considered these questions, we shall all, I think, come to the same conclusion; we shall all be agreed that we should have to risk very much, in any attempt to introduce any new Articles

of Religion, any authoritative definitions, that is, not so much of the faith itself once for all delivered to the saints, as of those special aspects and relations of it, which present license had developed, and that, even if we had at such risks succeeded, we should on the first occasion when our new expositions were subjected to the destructive processes at the disposal of the Court of Final Appeal, find that our labour had been thrown away, and our risks run for nothing.

But if the remedy which the Church requires does not lie in any attempt, however successful, to give more precision to her statements of Divine truth, is there any other means of escape from our difficulties? I would suggest one—one which, though of a moral rather than an intellectual character, can only be applied by those who, on intellectual grounds, acknowledge its value and claim. The remedy I allude to is simply this: a forbearing and conciliatory attitude maintained within certain limits on the part both of the Church and State in their relations towards one another.

And now, before I explain to you how such forbearance can be justified, and how it alone can relieve the Church from the grievance which is now felt to press so heavily upon it, I will first remind you what are the circumstances which suggest and recommend it.

The grievance which I have described to you has arisen out of, and involves questions which touch both the authority of the Church and State respectively, and the relations in which they

Relations of
Church
and State.

mutually stand towards each other in respect of such authority.

“ My Kingdom,” said our blessed Lord, “ is not of this world,” and by these words He described the claim of Himself and His body to authority, and also defined the limits of the authority which He so claimed.

Nothing can be clearer from the statements of Holy Scripture, than that our risen Saviour received, not as God, but as Mediator, a Kingdom—a body politic, organised, visible—and that He rules this Kingdom through His servants, “ to whom,” according to the parable, “ He hath delivered His goods”—that He made His apostles His Viceroy, gave them the keys of His Kingdom, and delegated to them such authority in their use that St. Paul was bold to say of himself and of those who shared with him this commission, “ He that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us His Holy Spirit.”^a

When then I speak of the Church, I am speaking of the visible Kingdom of the Mediator, and when I speak of its authority, I mean that it has the power and responsibility of defending the truth of God, and that this real since delegated, and inalienable power, is wholly spiritual, and owes nothing to any temporal source.

But this Kingdom, which was not of this world, was to find its place in the midst of the kingdoms of the world, and, when placed in them, had to exercise its independent authority in juxtaposition to the august and equally independent authority of the State.

^a 1 Thess. iv. 8.

Now, with this spiritual Body, as Christ's visible Church may be described, any kingdom of this world has, as such, the means and materials of coalescing; and in point of fact, the closest alliance has been formed at different times and in different places between the Church and the State. It has been argued by a man^a as eminent for his loyalty to the Church of God as for his devotion to the service of the State, that "The nation fulfils the great conditions of a *person*, and these in a definite manner and upon an extended scale, and with immense moral functions to discharge, and influences to exercise," and that, "therefore, it has that kind of clear, large, and conscious responsibility which can alone be met by its specifically professing a religion, and offering, through its organ, the State, that worship which shall publicly sanctify its acts."

But if this be so, there still remains the further question, how this personality, thus endowed with moral attributes, will express its will with regard to religion—what choice it will make—to what profession of religion it will ally itself—which, for example, of the multitudinous forms in our divided country it will, through its governing body, select as the religion of the nation. Up to this time it has, by God's mercy, selected the Church as the means of sanctifying its acts. This was the case before the Reformation, and though at that time the terms of the alliance were modified in some respects, yet if we give a

^a "Church and State," by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, vol. i., p. 105.

careful consideration to the details of the changes, we shall find that nothing was done which really compromised the Church as the depository of that inalienable authority which her Head had committed to her guardianship. I say this advisedly, with the knowledge both of those acts for which, in those trying times, the Church made herself responsible, and about the ecclesiastical character of which many grave doubts have been raised, and also of those acts on the part of the civil authority to which her assent was claimed as an establishment of the State.

Amongst the former, I place—

The giving to the King, in the year 1530, by both Houses of Convocation, the title of *Ecclesiæ et Cleri Anglicani Supremum Caput*.^a

The submission, as it is called, of the Clergy, and the various concessions contained in that submission, with regard to the assembling of Convocation—the “not attempting, alledging, claiming or putting in ure” any new Canons but by the King’s licence—the not “enacting, promulgating or executing” any such Canons without his assent—and the appointment of a commission by the Crown to review the laws of the Church.

The adoption by Convocation in 1562 of the Thirty-seventh Article.

The statements with regard to the King’s supremacy in the first, second, and thirty-sixth of the Canons, made in 1604, and the sanctions they contain of the acts of the civil power with regard to the supremacy.

^a See Appendix, p. 114.

The definition of the supremacy as attaching to the office of King, given in the first of the Canons, passed in 1640. *

These Synodical acts represent, I think, all the concessions which the Church has made with regard to its legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

But we are speaking of a Church which is established, or, in other words, has received the support of the authority of the civil power, and has, in this arrangement, admitted principles for determining the relations between herself and the State; and we must examine, not only her own Synodical acts, but the acts of the State also, in order to ascertain what these principles are. The great statutes which refer to this contract and alliance, are—24 Henry VIII. c. 12, 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, 1 Eliz. c. 1, s. 17. But the Statute of 1534, viz., 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, was repealed by 1 and 2 Phil. and M. c. 8, and when this Act was itself repealed in the 1 Eliz. c. 1, the repealing parts of it were preserved. To these statutes we must add the Acts of the State with regard to the Court of High Commission—to the transfer of the appellate jurisdiction from it to the Court of Delegates—and to the last transfer of the powers of the Crown in Chancery over ecclesiastical causes to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

And when we proceed to examine these documents, with a view of gauging the concessions about which

* Remarks on Royal Supremacy, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, p. 11.

I am speaking, we must do so both with an adequate knowledge of the amount and value of the many securities^a which the Church then possessed that the power she conveyed to the State would not be abused, and also with the thought that the principles of absolutism^b of this special period of our history, are probably more responsible for any undue compromises about liberty than any Erastian tendencies in the Church itself. We must also at the same time keep before our minds, when employed on such questions, that what the Church did at the Reformation by compact, she had done before in the exercise of her discretion; and, moreover, that there is the widest difference between jurisdictions^c which are only “for restraint,” and “corrective,” and jurisdictions which are “directive” and “motive,” as though conferring powers on the Church in the first instance for the discharge of her proper work, instead of merely superintending and regulating her exercise of those of which she is already inherently possessed.

And if we do thus try to give their true value, and meaning, and significance to these acts of the Church and the Civil Power, what will be our conclusion about them? Will it be that our Church, yielding to a temptation of a very aggravated character, so trafficked with her tempter as to sell her birthright for a very mess of pottage? I think not. Rather shall we find in such expressions as the following, the record of our most solemn convictions:—“The intention of the Reformation, taken generally, was to

^a “Remarks on the Royal Supremacy,” by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, p. 33. ^b Id. p. 48. ^c Id. pp. 7, 14.

place our religious liberties on a footing analogous to that on which our civil liberties had long stood. A supremacy of power in making and in administering Church-law as well as State-law was to vest in the Sovereign: but in making Church-law, he was to ratify the acts of the Church herself represented in Convocation, and if there were need of the highest civil sanctions, then to have the aid of Parliament also. And in administering Church-law, he was to discharge this function through the medium of Bishops and Divines, Canonists and Civilians, as her most fully authorized, best instructed sons, following in each case the analogy of his ordinary procedure as head of the State.” And, again:—“The essence of the whole arrangement was this: that the power of the Church to make laws was retained, but subjected to the consent of the Crown; the administration of Church-law was placed under the guardianship of the Crown, in a confidence, not disappointed through the succession of many generations, that her own Bishops, Divines, and Canonists would be the persons appointed to discharge her judicial functions.”^a

I have quoted these extracts from Mr. Gladstone’s pamphlet on the Royal Supremacy, because, as I said before, they give, I think, a true account of the relations in which the Church and State have agreed to stand to one another; but surely they must also suggest to any fair minded man that at the present moment there is reason for grave anxiety for the

^a “Remarks on the Royal Supremacy,” by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, pp. 49, 50.

cause of the liberty of the Church, and that all believers should, for their common faith, maintain the position so well stated by another eminent statesman, who is not likely to have made exaggerated claims for ecclesiastical bodies. In the words of M. Guizot, “The Church must be in her sphere as intact and as free as the State in hers.”^a

My Brethren, I yield to no man in prizing the establishment of the Church of God, and so the maintaining the acceptance of its doctrines on the part of the nation, but if I am ever brought to the sad necessity of choosing between the Church as an establishment and the Faith as its deposit, I trust I shall not hesitate for a moment. I have no common feeling with those who would lower the teaching of the Church to the standard of national opinion, but I would gladly surrender many of those privileges with which the piety of bygone days has surrounded Churchmen, if, by such a surrender, I could raise the measure of national belief to the standard of the Church.

And this all the more because I feel that our present isolated condition in Christendom, and the great work to which there are, to my mind, clear signs that GOD has elected us, should only make us, members of the Church of England, the more sensitive about any attempts to pare away our creed, and the more determined not to barter the truth of GOD, and the authority which he has given to us to guard it, for the sake of retaining the rich inheritance which

^a See Appendix, p. 108.

we have received from the piety of our nursing fathers and nursing mothers.

On the other hand, the fears which dictate such a warning would be very much allayed, if the State, in a spirit of like forbearance to that which the Church should show, would deal with the Establishment as being also the Church of God, and seek to regulate any determinations about Doctrine in her Courts by the decisions of the Church; or, in other words, by an authoritative exposition of the true meaning of her Articles and other Formularies. This I need scarcely say is not provided for by the existing Court of Final Appeal, where the presence of the two Primates and the Bishop of London lends an appearance of ecclesiastical character and authority to decisions for which the State alone is professedly, and really responsible. But supposing the Court is stripped (as I trust it will be) of its Pseudo-Ecclesiastical character, the State might still retain to herself the unrestricted power of testing any teaching which might be challenged as contradicting the teaching of the Church; only she should, in the exercise of this power, secure the assistance of such an exposition of the Doctrine of the Church as would solve any questions of the right interpretation of those statements of Doctrine which are recognised by law as authoritative.

Such interpretation can only be reached by construction, and it is in the exercise of this power that the advice of those who are “experts”^a should be used.

^a See Lord Lyttelton’s “Letter to the Chairman of a Clerical Meeting.”

I will not commit myself to say how this advice can be best provided. It is easier to say how it should not.

Thus, for example, I should consider a reference to a selected number of the Bishops of our Church as a most perilous experiment—one which might easily call into new life elements of sad discord in our Church.

Nor do I pretend to say that, even with the greatest forbearance and precaution, all difficulties and dangers to the Faith would be guarded against; but I believe that the risk of such occurrences would be very greatly diminished, and the ends of justice much better secured. A legal mind may be best qualified to weigh some kinds of evidence, and may in some cases be more indifferent, than is possible for Clergy, to the results of the trial, and so less biassed by eagerness for the cause of truth, and less tempted to do evil that good may come. I admit this. But in questions of truth and error, in discriminating between what is sound and what is unsound, nothing will compensate for the want of a knowledge of the past struggles of the spirit of truth and the spirit of error within the Church, and still less for the want of a theological tact which becomes a sort of theological instinct in those who have been duly trained in theological matters.

And here, again, I would remind you of what I ^{Re-union} _{of} have already said, that we must act with Christendom. the greatest wisdom, as for other causes, so all the more from the circumstances of our isolation.

Isolation! This indeed tells of our condition as a

Church, which, however necessary, however appointed for us, is associated with the thought of past corruptions of some perhaps undue reliance on the arm of flesh, and of present weakness ; and the consideration of it ought therefore to cause us sorrow, and yearnings for re-union with our separated brethren.

And surely we may hope that the finger of God's Providence is, by our present troubles, pointing to this normal condition of the Body of Christ, its unity, as a means of escape from such troubles ; surely we may almost dare to believe that the Saviour's prayer for the unity of the members of His Body is taking effect through these late assaults on the common inheritance of Christendom, and is preparing the hearts of men for communion with one another in one faith, by placing them side by side in a common defence of some of its articles.

I can truly say that this was my own feeling with regard to the Protestant Dissenters, when I received a token from one at Manchester, of his readiness to bear part of the burden which he thought was mine.

I think also that no one can have read the work of M. Renan without feeling that he, by his infidel encroachments on the inheritance which we share with the Church of France, has by creating the sympathy which attends upon a united resistance to a common danger, contributed something towards removing the barriers which have long parted us from that celebrated communion, and so towards re-awaking in the Universal Church the blessed Spirit of "Truth, Unity, and Concord." Be it ours never

to forget the solemn words of Count de Maistre : “ If Christians should ever draw towards each other—and every consideration might urge them to do so—it seems that the first advance would most naturally be made by the Church of England.”^a

The attempts also which Convocation has sanctioned to enter into friendly relations with the Eastern Church synchronise, we cannot but observe, with our late controversies. And it is to these same assaults, which God has, in His Providence, permitted men to make on the faith, that we owe the following stirring warning with which M. Guizot has very lately prefaced his *Meditations on the Essence of the Christian Religion* :—“ It is in fact the whole Christian Church, and not this or that Christian Church in particular, which is at the present day the object of attack in its fundamental principles. When the Supernatural, the Inspiration of the Sacred Books, and the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ are denied, the blow falls upon all Christians whether Catholics, Protestants, or Greeks : and all Christians, whatever may be their private grounds of disagreement from each other, or their forms of Church Government, are robbed of the very bases of their faith. And it is by their faith, that all the Churches of Christ maintain their life. There is no description of Civil Government, be it Monarchy or Republic, be it centralized or shared by many local authorities, which is equal to the work of upholding a Church. There is no

^a See Appendix, p. 108.

authority so strong, no freedom so broad and wide as to be able to take the place and do the work of faith in a Religious Society. For the unity of a Church is the union of souls, and it is a common faith which really bands souls together. When then the foundations of their common faith are assailed, differences which may exist between Christian Churches on particular questions, or points of contrast in their organisation and government, come to possess only a secondary interest : since Churches have to protect themselves against a danger common to each and all, when the spring which supplies each one of them with the common draught of life is itself threatened with exhaustion.”^a

It will readily occur to an English Churchman that the questions which M. Guizot might deem to be of secondary importance—those, for example, which affect the constitution of the Church of Christ, are in reality more intimately linked with our existing controversies than M. Guizot would concede ; but I am unwilling to forego for this reason the pleasure of quoting a passage in which the present perils of Christendom are so forcibly described by so high an authority.

And what is of even still greater moment to us, and of less embarrassed liberty of feeling, this common danger has taught many of the members of our own communion, who have ere now looked at one another with suspicion, to satisfy them-

^a See Appendix, p. 108.

selves that much was groundless, that some causes of distrust were capable of such explanation as should satisfy the hearts of brethren, and that it was possible to be loyal to one's own convictions and to the truth itself, and yet make allowance for the natural differences of intellectual and moral organisation, and the various expressions given to such differences.

I think that I can see many tokens of this reawakening of the dormant spirit of unity. Thus I recognise, as one instance of this, the hearty way in which men belonging to different schools of thought in the Church, equally delight to give expression to their value for souls, and their sense of what is due to God, by rebuilding or refitting their parish Churches. Churchmen may have special fears and dislikes, and special hopes and sympathies, and they may place the mark of these differences upon such good works as I am speaking of, but not so as to disturb the conviction that the doers of such works are all Brethren, united together by the bonds of one communion.

Again, I would refer to the still greater work in which the members of the Diocese, whether lovers of a Choral Service or not, are united, namely, the restoration of our Cathedral, both as another evidence of this growth of good will and brotherly confidence, and also as an earnest of a very general recognition of the truth of the principles which underlie the existence of a Cathedral Church, and which give it a claim to be the Mother Church of the Diocese. Nor can I, in saying this, forget that it is

more difficult for the members of one part of my Diocese to realise their connection with our Cathedral, than it is for the other, and, I am, therefore, the more thankful that both the Clergy and Laity of Dorset are each year more and more acting upon the unifying thought that their present relation to the Cathedral of Salisbury and its Bishop is only a renewal of time-hallowed ties.

And here I must record my witness that the many able and peaceful discussions in Convocation of matters involving great principles by men who were not supposed to be at one with one another in the faith, though members of the same Church, have tended to bring about this nearer approach to unity; and in speaking more particularly of my own Diocese, I can say the same with regard to the Ruri-Decanal Chapters.

If I am called upon to give my opinion as to their beneficial influence, I can, with a thankful heart, declare my belief that they have helped my Clergy, without any unworthy compromise of their principles, to discover that while the points of agreement among them were both manifold and important, those on which they disagreed were comparatively few and of slighter moment.

It is the opinion of many that these good results would be more manifest if the Bishop were to summon his clergy and some of his laity to meet annually, or less frequently, in a Diocesan Synod.

I have ascertained that this is not the unanimous

opinion of the Clergy of this Diocese, and that some of you think you have already sufficient opportunities of considering together questions affecting the Church, and that there is no adequate cause for encountering the difficulties which certainly beset the gathering together of a Diocesan Synod.

Whatever course I may eventually adopt with regard to such Synods, I shall be assisted in coming to the decision by knowing the judgments—or, perhaps, I should say the impressions—of my Clergy about the revival of them.

At the present time I would remind you that the question of the constitution and functions of such Synods is a very large and eventful one, and is only a part of the still larger question which concerns both the power given to the universal episcopate, and to each Bishop of that body, “*Cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*,” and the relation also in which ecumenical, provincial, and diocesan Synods stand to the authority of the universal episcopate.

But large and difficult as the question is, there is, without doubt, much in the present times to give prominence to it, and to make men anxious to solve it.

The present position of the Church with regard to the civil authority, and the sound counsel of this authority to which I have already referred, to look elsewhere than to it for the exposition and maintenance of the truths of our holy religion, seemed to suggest the duty of re-affirming the Faith in Synod; and the danger of fresh attempts on the part of this

same authority to change the Doctrine of the Establishment, and so to denationalise the Church, led to the same conclusion about this revival of Diocesan Synods.

However, in such matters, even undue delay is better than precipitate haste, and should it eventually be thought expedient to call together a Diocesan Synod, the measure will not the less approve itself to the consciences of loyal and prudent men, because it is that which, having been suggested in the hour of danger, was matured in a season it may be of comparative rest and safety.

But I shall now pass on to other duties and functions, about which I may speak with more ^{our faith not} distinctness, and the due discharge of ^{a matter of} _{opinion} which will tend to make the status of ^{or} _{sentiment} the Church, as the guardian of God's truth, more secure.

And in the forefront, I would charge you not to receive yourselves, or to give others occasion by your conduct to receive as true, either the assertion that the faith of a Christian man is a matter only of opinion, or the other kindred position, that his faith is a matter of sentiment. Both of these statements are false, and the truth is as follows. God has been pleased to set before the eye of the soul objects which that eye can distinguish, some with more, others with less precision, some before its powers are matured, others only when those powers are, by God's grace, in their full vigour and perfection. And further these objects thus apprehended by Faith, which is an in-

tellectual faculty, are appreciable by the reason of man, and capable of scientific treatment. Thus, in addition to the sufficient claims they address to the believer's mind and heart on the ground of authority, they have a further claim to his assent and consent, as having on their side, if not in all, or possibly most cases, demonstrative evidence of their truth, every variety of evidence, from that which justifies the lowest reasonable presumption up to that which warrants the highest certainty.

And to us, the Clergy, is committed by God, with more or less responsibility, the duty of asserting these claims of truth, and of doing our very utmost to vindicate and recommend them; or, in other words, of recognising our obligation to be theologians, and to take all pains to become so.

I use these words advisedly, to make a real, and what should be a practical distinction.

There ought not to be any great difficulty in determining that the study of theology is a necessary part of every clergyman's training, and for this reason. One of the characteristics of the present day is the great advance which has been made in the scientific treatment of that part of the field of knowledge which is connected with the world of nature. Now, the knowledge which is pre-eminent in dignity is, beyond all question, religious knowledge; but this knowledge would, to say the least, find the difficulty of maintaining its claims to this first position increased, if these claims could not be appreciated by the intellect, and if the doctrines of our Holy Reli-

gion were not also, as the other parts of knowledge are, susceptible of scientific treatment.

But this they are, and the Church has been ever conscious that they are so, and has well used this powerful means for recommending and defending them.

The records of her history tell you that she has ever known the distinction drawn in the following words of an eminent theologian, and has in her struggles with false teachers embodied the principles contained in his statement:—“*Est facile et apertum fidei Theologiæque discrimen: quod fides proxime et ut sic dicam immediate auctoritate nititur; Theologia vero proxime et immediate ratione. Habent enim se fides, et Theologia non aliter quam habitus principiorum, et scientia conclusionum.*”^a

An example of such an intellectual treatment of religious truth will be found at once in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and it is forgetfulness of the connexion between the science of Theology and Religion—of the relation in which the former stands to the moral and spiritual state of the mind and heart—that makes men impatient of those barriers which the enlightened intellect of the Church has raised, more especially in the Athanasian Creed, against the encroachments of error, and so in reality against the limitation of God’s “incomprehensible” truth, to the narrow rule of mere human opinion.

I have myself been ever brought up to join in this

^a Melchior Canus, t. ii., lib. xii., p. 135.

confession of faith with Eucharistic feelings, and these feelings have become stronger and stronger as my responsibilities have increased. I was, therefore, rejoiced to find my own experience confirmed by the testimony given to it in his last Charge by the present Bishop of Calcutta. His words, indeed, are so remarkable on this point, that I shall quote them at length, in the hope that I may thereby confirm your allegiance (if in any case it is shaken) to that noble monument of the Church's faith against all such as, in imposing their own sense of its meaning, do in effect narrow its limits. The Bishop says—"In the case of the Athanasian Creed there is much to be learned from coming to India. One who resides in the midst of a heathen nation begins to realise the state of things in which the primitive bishops and fathers of the Church drew up their confessions of faith. For the errors rebuked in the Athanasian Creed resulted from tendencies common to the human mind everywhere, and especially prevalent in this country. We cannot too strongly impress on those who recoil from its definitions and distinctions that its object was not to limit but to widen the pale of the Church, which various heretical sects were attempting to contract. It contains no theory of the Divine nature, but contradicts certain false opinions about it, and states the revealed truths of the Trinity and Incarnation without any attempt to explain them. It especially censures four errors: the heresy of Arius, who 'divided the substance' of the Godhead, by teaching that the Father was the supreme and the Son an inferior deity; of Sabellius,

who 'confounded the Persons,' by supposing that the Father took our nature as the man Christ Jesus, and after dying for our salvation operates on our hearts as the Holy Ghost; of Nestorius, who so completely separated our Lord's divinity and humanity as to teach that He is not one but two Christs; and of Apollinaris, who asserted that He was not perfect man, with a reasonable (or rational) soul, but a being in whom the Godhead supplied the place of the human intellect. Now these four tendencies correspond to four forms of error which are in full activity among us here. The chief cause of the horror with which Arianism was regarded by the fathers of Nicaea was that it led directly back to the polytheism from which Constantine had just delivered the Roman Empire. Had it prevailed, Christianity would have been degraded into the worship of three Gods, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with the Father as the Lord and Ruler of the other two. Arianism, therefore, so far as it was polytheistic, resembled the religion of the common people in India. The theory of Sabellius, fatal to the truths of Christ's mediation and atonement, arose from that bare and unsympathising monotheism, which has since been erected by Mahomet into a rival and hindrance to the Gospel. The foremost of Indian sects in public spirit and intelligence inherit from their Persian ancestors the doctrine of two co-ordinate independent principles, Ormuzd and Ahriman, Good and Evil, with the first of which Spirit, and with the other Matter is immediately concerned. From

a tendency to this very same error, Nestorius separated altogether Christ's divine from His human nature, although such a view leads to the denial that this world is redeemed from evil, and that man's body as well as his soul and spirit must be consecrated to God's service. The creed of many among the educated classes of India, and of not a few, I fear, in Europe, is the theory of pantheism, which quenches in us the love of God, since we cannot feel affection for One who has no personal attributes, and which is at last fatal to morality, by teaching that evil is only an inferior stage of good, 'good in the making,' as some one has expressed it, so that the two are in fact identical, each having alike its origin in God. From pantheistic sympathies, Apollinaris, the precursor of Eutyches, was led to merge Christ's Manhood in His Godhead, and to deny that he had a human soul. Now, if we remember that all these heresies sprang from tendencies which have given birth to separate religions of widely-extended influence, in the midst of which we in India are living, we may surely pause before we expunge from the records of our Church an ancient protest against the application of these tendencies to Christianity, since, whenever the educated classes of this country generally embrace the Gospel, there will be need of watchfulness, lest its simplicity be perverted by the revival of errors which all had their origin in Eastern philosophy."^a

I entirely agree with all this, and I thank God that

^a Charge of the Bishop of Calcutta, 1863, pp. 38, 39, 40.

the Church in India is being built on so sure a foundation, not upon the shifting sands of human opinion, the anti-dogmatic principle of Liberalism, but on the strong rock of dogmatic teaching.

And here it seems natural to give another example in illustration of my meaning, and this with The Formularies are
Dogmatic. a view of asserting the claims of our whole Prayer-book to be considered part of the same foundation of dogmatic truth.

Our formularies are to be placed on the same level in this respect, with our Creeds and Articles. The Book of Common Prayer exemplifies the old saying, "lex orandi lex docendi," and for this very simple reason. The Church, when she helps her members to present themselves before their God, and directs them how to make known to Him their wants, cannot, as she masters the thought who He is to whom she is guiding them, but provide for them in word and deed, what betokens reverent care.

Thus her words of prayer are drawn up with the most reverent precision. She does not think it a time or place in which her children should indulge, without self-restraint, in rhetorical effusions of exaggerated feeling, or in inaccurate statements; but she feels that under such circumstances the best is to be given to God, and that the sacrifice of the heart should be offered to Him in words which have been chosen by the accurate intellect and the refined tact of the exact theologian. And in proof of my assertion that an obligation lies upon us to be theologians, I refer you to that work which can only be fully ap-

preciated by the theologian, our Book of Common Prayer.

I have been led into these remarks on the Creeds and Book of Common Prayer, as illustrating my warning that Religion is not based upon mere opinion. But if it be not this, neither is it the expression of mere sentiment. Love is a work of faith, and that faith which worketh by love has thus energised and acted, because certain definite objects have been set before it, and it has embraced those objects and perceived intellectually, it may be said, that they are equally "lovely," and "of good report." To use the words of another, "As well can there be filial love without the fact of a father, as devotion without the fact of a Supreme Being." Most true. The eye of the soul may indeed see the object presented to it, and yet the heart be unmoved by the sight. That eye may discern the Cross of Calvary, and even recognise in Him who is hanging on it, the Eternal Son, and yet the recipient of such a vision may remain a stranger to fear and reverence, and awe, and devotion; but where these exist, where the soul's affections are the counterparts of the sentiments of St. Paul and St. John—you may be quite certain that it has had a revelation, and that its religious emotions have been under the influence of the object of faith which had been placed before it by God's grace. And yet it is one of the commonplaces of the day, that true religion is not to be confounded with orthodoxy. Men are now constantly warned, as if the fact was a recent discovery, that it is possible to be sound in

the faith, and yet bear no fruit of love and good works. Of course we admit such a premiss, but we reject as utterly illogical the conclusion that there is, therefore, no connexion between doctrinal and practical religion.

But when I maintain that religion is not a matter of mere opinion, or again, of sentiment, but rather of demonstrable truth, I do not forget that it is one thing to recognise these claims of religious knowledge to scientific treatment, and another to discharge these claims—that it is one thing, for example, to make a candidate for Holy Orders appreciate the fact that the subject matter of the teaching which he will have to minister to others, has been evolved and developed by the intellect of man, under the influence of various external circumstances, and that the processes of such reasonings have been conducted with the same precision, exactness, and discrimination as the processes by which the philosopher reaches any other scientific conclusion, and that, consequently, the teacher should be ever on his guard not to pass, however slightly, the limits which an exact theology has established ; and that it is another thing to qualify such candidate for the practical observance of the obligation he has been made to perceive ; in other words, to make him sound in the faith, and thus able to do justice to its scientific character and resources, whether in building up those committed to his charge, or in resisting gainsayers.

Such thoughts must be ever pressing with very

Theological special force upon persons in my position ;
College. and in my case they led me to be most anxious to found a Theological College, and I feel most grateful that God has so far blessed my endeavours, that such an Institution, with a small endowment, is now secured for ever to my Diocese by law.

My object in founding it has been to train those whose hearts are drawn by the Holy Spirit to the Ministry of the Church, not only to discredit the prevailing error, that religion is either a matter of opinion or of sentiment, but also to receive with a strong intellectual grasp the authoritative teaching of the Church—to appreciate the scientific exposition of this authoritative teaching—to acquire those habits of reverence, and care, and discrimination which become those who are teachers of an exact science, and instead of eventually giving occasion to lookers-on to point to their Ministry as evidence that religion has no necessary connection with the creed of the Christian, to gain the power of setting before themselves and of reaching such a high standard of life and conversation, that they may thus effectually, by example, teach the true doctrine, “ Believe, and thou shalt be saved.”

Such has been my object ; and the means I am taking to effect it are these. I have secured to the students instruction of the best kind in the Word of God, the Formularies of the Church, and such books as “ Butler’s Analogy,” “ Bishop Pearson on the Creed,” and “ Hooker’s Fifth Book of the Ecclesiastical Polity ;” and I have provided for the deepening

and giving permanence to the conviction, that whilst the habit of prayer and of Holy Communion is one of the very best securities against that spirit of infidelity, which, as I have shown above, is specially instanced in the denial of the supernatural, it is also the means by which alone we can obtain the blessing of God, and so reach the end of a training of mind and heart for the Ministry.

In thus mentioning only study and prayer, I am not forgetting, but intend to include, all the details of the exercises of mind and heart of which such study and prayer are, both in theory and practice, composed.

But I must return to the subject on which I was engaged when I digressed into some account of my Theological College, and resume the course of my address to you on some of the duties and functions of your Ministry, which, from circumstances, seem to call, at the present day, for special notice.

With a view to the faithful discharge of these duties and functions, you should ever strive to deepen your sense of the preciousness of souls, and of the force of God's truth in saving them, and so seek to fulfil their conceptions who rightly value all subjective religion, and are only in error in their teaching on this subject, from their disconnecting it with the objects of faith.

And one of the ways in which you can attain to this truer value for souls and God's truth, Retreats. is by withdrawing for a while from your ordinary duties, and giving yourselves alone, or in

communion with others, to prayer, self-examination, meditation, and other religious exercises.

The question has more than once been suggested to me, whether I could devise any plan by which my Clergy might thus have the benefit of such religious retirement, or as it is more technically called, of a Retreat, and I feel, I own, that ere this I ought to have given some definite and favourable answer to such a question. I think that every one of us must be satisfied that it would be well for us to have in the wear and tear of life special times for self-recollement, and for placing ourselves, as immediately as our powers may enable us to do, in the presence of our merciful but just God. A clergyman is certainly not free from very special temptations to be less earnest than any man can safely be in the cure of his own soul. The very studies, pursuits, activities, and duties of his calling may, without great watchfulness, be a snare to him, and being gradually and imperceptibly substituted for acts of communion with God and his own soul, may become most serious lets and hindrances to the advancement of the spiritual life, and thus, not only obscure, if not altogether extinguish, his own hope, but also proportionally diminish the power and effect of his ministrations to others.

It is, of course, easy to say that this should not be, that they whose vocation is to set forward the salvation of others should, above all men, be able to put their true value upon God's gifts of grace to themselves; but, nevertheless, you know, my dear

Brethren, that what I say is true, and also that it is no easy matter to check these evil influences of the circumstances of our profession.

And if this is so, it does certainly seem only natural that we should periodically place ourselves beyond such influences as far as may be, and try to the best of our power to test the condition of our souls, to gauge the very depths of our spiritual state, and to seek those healing balms which our Heavenly Father is ever ready to pour into any wounds, the pain of which we feel, and the healing of which we desire, and the remedies for which we faithfully seek. Such special acts of retirement from ordinary duties, and of self-examination, and of meditation, are of course not to be substitutes for daily care for ourselves, nor indeed, for the daily performance of all these same things, but are to be means of giving us a deeper sense of our necessities—a more lively faith in the preciousness of the riches of Christ—and a stronger will to secure them.

And supposing it is objected, that there are difficulties in the way of such provisions for our souls' health—that such attempts to strip from the soul periodically the dress of false motive, of lukewarmness, and of want of loving, tender sympathy with both the sorrows and the joys of the Head of the Church, and to robe it in the white apparel which our Lord is ever ready to bestow on those who earnestly seek it, are, though excellent in themselves, not free from danger, when formally sanctioned by those in authority, and means are adopted for their

recognition by the public conscience of the Church, the answer is, that all associated efforts for objects however good and holy require the guidance of prudence, wisdom, faith, and charity.

At present it seems to me that the simplest way of initiating, under these safeguards, some such measure as has thus been suggested to me, would be to obtain the loan for a short time of a Parsonage and Church, and to secure the guidance of some one well skilled in such treatment of souls. This might be done in different parts of the Diocese, and the only real difficulty would be to find those who could, by those gifts just mentioned, of prudence, wisdom, faith, and charity, give effect to this pious wish for spiritual growth. And I cannot but believe that under such guidance in the use of means well selected for such an end, we should in this way do something to replenish the springs of our spiritual life, and so strengthen our powers of sympathy with the objects of faith, that our lives would more and more exemplify, and, as it were, reflect the true doctrine, that those attainments in grace which, by their very loveliness, win to their side the unbelieving world, and which are usually associated with subjective religion, are, in truth, but the expression of a clearer, since more undisturbed, perception of those objects of faith which God has set before the soul. You will all, my Brethren, acknowledge the force and beauty of the following invitation:—"Veni in solitudinem, fili; et non tantum aquam mundam, ut ab omnibus iniquitatibus

tuis emenderis, effundam super te ; verum etiam gratiarum pretiosissimarum flumen, cuius impetus animam tuam lætificabit. Ibi sublimem æternarum veritatum cognitionem tibi dabo : ibi meam voluntatem notam tibi faciam : ibi manu victrixi tardam tuam naturam ad bonum movebo.”

But if there be some doubt about the value of this or any other means for making us more faithful stewards of the goods of Jesus Christ our Lord, there can be none about the end thus proposed ; and it is with regard to some points connected with this that I would now speak to you, with all the urgency which the subject, and I think I may say my sense of responsibility, suggests.

You have, my Brethren, to minister the Word of God and His Holy Sacraments to the congregation to which you are lawfully appointed ; and the salvation of souls depends on the way in which you fulfil the duties thus entrusted to you. Force, I pray you, this thought upon your souls, you have not only to discharge a duty, but so to discharge it as to save souls. Oh ! this is indeed a thought of almost overwhelming power, and the weight of which no mind could bear which was sensible of its full and terrible meaning, unless that mind was supported by a sure trust in God’s infinite mercy.

And he who has such a trust will give clear evidence that he possesses it.

Thus, for example, my Brethren, you should, in reliance on the sure mercies of God, take care that

you accept yourselves, with unhesitating confidence, every part of the message of God which, as ambassadors of God, you are about to convey to your brother men. If your sermon leaves the impression that you are delivering not a certain unquestionable message from God to His creatures, but something which may be either a Revelation of God or only an opinion of man, you cannot hope to be building up your hearers in their most holy faith. The preacher who utters words with faltering lips and with a stammering tongue, cannot expect to persuade men. And, of course, this applies not only to his convictions about the truth of God's Word, but to his realisation of God's message by such close communion with Him, as to feel in his inmost being the power of His promises and threats, and to draw into his soul the influences of His revealed mercy and justice.

He, then, who neglects the study of God's Word, or from careless or unfrequent prayers has not received upon his heart any inscription of God's truth and will, of the counsels of His grace, and of the terrors of His wrath, cannot speak to the souls of men as one who knows their real wants, their sufferings, and dangers, and who has also had entrusted to him that which will relieve them, that which will be balm to their wounds, and be the means of conveying them in the ship of the Lord to the haven of rest and peace, where they would be.

The two great qualifications of a preacher are, first, the knowledge of the truth ; and, secondly, the love of it. And so, if you have these, my Brethren, you

will undoubtedly be able to do the work to which God has called you, whether it be to save many souls or only a few.

With regard to the selection of the proper portion of that truth of which you have received the knowledge, you must, of course, be guided by many considerations which experience alone can enable you to distinguish ; but my counsel to those who are young in the Ministry, is that they should endeavour to lead their congregations into all truth, by rightly dividing it, according to the form and order of the Church. If they will not only keep in mind what is the season of the Church, but what are the special lessons in doctrine and practice which the Church connects with particular days, by means of certain portions of Holy Scripture, they will, in the course of the year, have placed before the minds of their people a whole cycle of religious knowledge, and this based on certain great historical facts and economies.

I would further urge them to master the leading idea of such Scripture teaching, as is contained in the portions of God's Word which are proper for the Morning Prayer and Communion Office, and to endeavour by prayer and meditation to make it their own—to gather around the leading idea contained in them whatever the circumstances of either their ministrations or their studies may suggest, and also to give it a deeper foundation in their hearts' convictions by communicating it to others as occasion shall be given in their more private ministrations.

The results of attention to such advice would I am

persuaded be very great, both to the preacher and to the hearers. The preacher would gain a constant strengthening of his grasp of the truth of Christ, as revealed in Holy Scripture, and an equal increase of his power of giving utterance to the truth, with God's gift of holy unction, and that persuasiveness which he alone possesses who has complied with the precept: “*Imple cor tuum eloquis meis ut ex abundantiâ cordis os loquatur.*”

And the hearer would have cause to recognize in his own soul the preacher's work for him. He would thankfully feel that his heart and mind were bending into submission to the claims of God's truth, the authoritative declaration of which had been recommended, both by the order and precision of an intellectual system and by the cogency of the *ἡθικὴ πίστις*—the indescribable influence of the preacher's unhesitating belief.

It follows of course that such preaching and such hearing would make the work of the ministry in all its details of claims and duty far more easy. I will give some instances of what I mean.

One of the duties—a very primary one—of every clergyman is, to do his best to persuade his

^{Missions.} people that one of the tests of a living faith is an interest in the Foreign Missions of the Church,^a whether to our Colonies or to the Heathen. Now at the present moment there is the greatest need of means of using the opportunities which God has,

^a See Appendix, p. 93.

in His Providence, given us for this purpose. Both men and money are wanted.

The Archbishop of this province invited, a few weeks ago, many influential Churchmen to meet together, to consider what could be done. At that meeting one of the Colonial Bishops, who has been visiting different parts of our Church, stated that he had been grieved to find that the missionary spirit was less fervent than it was a few years ago. If this be so, there is no wonder that the number of those who are ready to give themselves to the work, and even of those who only give their gold and silver, does not increase in proportion as the calls of God to his Church to do the work which He has committed to it, multiply. With regard to the means for the support of Missions, one account of their inadequacy is, I think, that the Clergy are not sufficiently frequent or urgent in their appeals.

And even with regard to the supply of men for Missionary work, whether in our Colonies or elsewhere, although it may be urged that there have been many causes which may in part explain the unwillingness of young men to give themselves to this work of God—that the worldly temptations of wealth and exciting employment have been of late unusually great—that the tendency of modern thought—of the Liberalism in Religion of the present day, is to weaken the foundations of religious conviction, and so to make any purposes of sacrifice indeterminate—still I am persuaded that if we, the Clergy, more realised ourselves the character of such a service, and the

claims of our Lord to have such service rendered to Him, and made our teaching an exponent of such convictions in unexaggerated, but glowing words of love for God's truth, we should lead captive many minds and hearts, and find the difficulty about alms pass away. A statement will, I believe, soon be published by the Archbishops and Bishops and others on this subject, and when it reaches you, I entreat that you will give it your most earnest consideration.

The time selected for such an especial appeal seems to me indeed a most favourable one, for it is concurrent with a most noble display of courageous zeal for God's truth. One of the Churches which would receive part of any increased alms for Missions is the African Church, which is now attracting to herself the anxious hopes and the admiration of Chris-

^{Bishop of} tendom. I will not dwell upon the painful ^{Capetown.} details of the case. You are all too familiar with them. But let any one try to picture to himself what would be the prospect for the truth of God in Africa if that infant Church had a Metropolitan of a worldly, craven spirit—one who pleaded, as the Bishop of Capetown might have pleaded, his want of the machinery of a legal Court, and the insecurity of his relations to the Church of England—one who, perhaps, added to such a plea, that the claims of other official and practical duties made it impossible for him to enter upon an intricate Theological inquiry. Let any one, I say, consider how much we owe to the special providence of God in this matter, and I am sure that he will feel that never was there a stronger demand upon the

members of the Church for their thanksgivings, their prayers, and their alms. I have often before now asked you to join with me in prayer every Friday morning, that our Colonists and the Heathen might receive the fulness of that Blessing which our Lord purchased for them, as on that day, at Calvary, and now I feel that the time has again come for the renewal of this earnest entreaty, of this charge to my Brethren, and to make the plea of the Church of Africa, "Ora pro nobis," the occasion of more regular, fervent prayer for all the Missions of the Church.

And as I said that it was to Sermons that we ought most to trust for the increase of a ^{Pastoral} Letters. self-sacrificing spirit, and for almsgiving, so I say that it is by them that we must seek to stir up this spirit of prayer; and it seems to follow naturally upon such a statement that I should next remind you of the means which I have taken, by Pastoral Letters, of enlisting through you the sympathies of your people around some works of the Church. You will find an account of the results of these appeals amongst the statistical matter which will be appended to this Charge.^a With regard to the sums offered on such occasions to God, I shall not say one word. I never allow myself to try to estimate what others ought to give, unless I am specially consulted, and have elements out of which to form a right opinion; but with regard to the omission of all appeal to your congregations (no uncommon case) I cannot be silent, and

* See Appendix, p. 93.

I entreat you to listen to what I have to say to you on the subject. The objects for which a Bishop seeks the support of his Diocese are, of course, only those objects in which all alike ought to have an equal interest—rich and poor, clergy and laity. And if any one has by office a right to claim for any particular object such co-operation and sympathy that person is the Bishop of the Diocese. But a difficulty might meet him at once in the attempt to discharge this duty, and it is this. Many of these works have been undertaken, not by the Church herself, through any recognised organization, but through societies, that is, associations of Churchmen, who are engaged not only in furthering certain objects, but in furthering them under certain restrictions, and with certain well understood convictions. Now, either the Bishop of the Diocese, or the Parish Priest, or the Laity of the parish, may distrust certain associations, or at any rate give their preference to some rather than the others, and if Pastoral Letters overlooked these distinctions, it would only be fair and reasonable to expect that many would satisfy themselves that they could not be expected to give that aid to a cause, however good, which included the support of a society which they more or less distrusted. To obviate this difficulty, I have commended to you *objects*, and have left with the Clergy and their Laity the choice of societies, or other instruments for furthering those objects; and I do not even ask to know what choice of instruments has been made. Such a course removes at least one difficulty, and the only one which, to my

mind ought, as a general rule, to be pleaded in excuse for not giving effect to the Bishop's request.

However, the excuses which reach me from my Clergy for not complying with my letter are very various. I will mention some. One of my brethren, for example, says, "It weakens my influence to be always asking for alms." But to him I would say, throw the whole burden on your Bishop, say to those who complain, that you are only giving a proof of your readiness to obey in all things lawful and honest. Another says, "The charities of my parish are ill-supported, and they have the first claim." But to him I would say, the joining in some Diocesan work of charity will not be an hindrance to, but a real means of helping your parochial charities. Another says, "My people are very poor, they can make no offering worth having." But I am bound to say in reply, that the contribution, which may be very small in the eyes of man may be very large in the eyes of God, and may include that mite, which will bring down, through the widow's faith, manifold gifts of grace to her fellow parishioners.

I will not refer to other excuses, but will only add that not one of them would, I think, be considered of any real value, if those to whom my letter is addressed deeply appreciated the objects which I commend to them, and received such commendations with hearts constrained by a sense of the blessedness of communion with their brethren in good works, and of the exceeding power of co-operation, and of the duty of their Bishop to strengthen the bonds of such com-

munion, and to offer to the great Head of the Church the fruits of such co-operation. Under the influence of such convictions no question would, I am satisfied, arise in most cases about pleading for such an object; and sermons holding thoughts, and arguments, and exhortations drawn from minds and hearts so impressed, would soon, I cannot but think, remove the grounds of those complaints which they now urge, who have nobly, with their lives in their hands in many cases, gone forth to preach the Gospel in foreign lands, and are disheartened by the small amount of the support rendered to them by their brethren at home.

But whilst I look to Sermons as the great means of quickening the hearts of Churchmen into more active sympathy with the work their Lord has committed to them, I do not forget that there are many ways in which the effect of such ministration of the Word of God may be not only sustained, but increased.

Whatever you can do to strengthen the interest of your people in the details of the work, and their confidence in the instruments chosen for carrying it on, this you should do: for example, it is right not only to inform them of the amount of the alms collected for any purpose, and their application, but also to give them an annual statement of all that can be called the alms-deeds of the parish.

My own attention has, during the last year, been called to one branch of this subject, by a very honoured and loyal member of the Church, Mr.

Sootheron-Estcourt, who advises me that much of the past difficulties about the support of religious objects would be removed if the persons appealed to had a conspectus of all such works, and of the amount of support which these had obtained ; and at the same time I received from one of my Rural Deans very similar advice.^a

At present I do not see my way to prepare so perfect a conspectus as that recommended to me, but you will find in the Appendix a suggestion for a conspectus of the chief Diocesan Societies, which might certainly be adopted, and which would, I think, be a wise measure, and one which would lessen the suspicion that such appeals were unjustifiably multiplied, and might, therefore, be properly passed by.

But you have another ministration committed to you. You have been called to minister not only God's Word, but also the Holy Sacra-^{The Holy Sacraments.}ments. Statistics are, I have already admitted, very unreliable tests of this part of the work of your ministry, but such as they are, you will find a report of them in the Appendix. The teaching about them divides itself into two great heads. The one is, "They are generally necessary to salvation." The other is, "Consider the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof." Everything, which it behoves you to press upon your peoples' hearts and minds, may be ranged under one or other of these two heads ; and you must draw out the full meaning of each of these two texts. You must not so balance the one against

^a See Appendix, p. 169.

the other that they both cease to have any weight in the scales of the conscience, and you must take care not to lay the weight of the one on the conscience, without also laying the weight of the other. Such faithful teaching will lead on your parts to very frequent celebrations, and also to the most reverent and affectionate care in preparing souls for such mysterious blessings ; and what you will recognise to be your duty at all times, you will give yourselves to with more special care at particular seasons.

Thus, the language of the spiritual father to each of those whom he has presented for confirmation will be, " You must, my child, be a communicant," and also, you must not dare to come other than " holy and clean to such a heavenly feast, in the marriage garment required by God in Holy Scripture." The most careful preparation will not seem unnecessary to those who believe with our Church that " our Heavenly Father has given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in the Holy Sacrament ;" and in speaking of this preparation I would particularly urge you, my Reverend Brethren, to caution those committed to your charge against the perils of indiscriminate reading.

I specially mention this caution, because it seems to me that the present practice of reading without selection, is most perilous to the soul. Books, embodying evil principles, and especially those which are written in a flippant, or scornful, or sceptical spirit, or which tend to awaken tender feelings for

vice, are to be looked upon as so much corruption. It may be necessary for some persons to expose their souls to such infection, but those, whom duty calls into such danger, are very few in comparison with those who readily almost court exposure to such perils. I say this all, my dear Brethren, very advisedly, and with very definite reasons for doing so before my mind.

And this and all kindred subjects lead up to one which has engrossed much attention of late, ^{The Order for the Burial of the Dead.} namely, the Order for the Burial of the Dead. All the ministrations of the Word and Sacraments are with a view to death and the final judgment; and when death has come then the Church is called upon to discharge one of her most solemn functions, and to commit to the ground the bodies of her dead with some becoming act of worship of God and of communion with them. The persons who have this claim upon her offices are the members of Christ's Mystical Body, and she can only discharge this claim by words of faith, such, for example, as expressions of hope, reflecting the great truths that Christ "brought life and immortality to light," and "opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers"—of praise and thanksgiving to God for perfecting the work in His elect, and by the removal of this member of His Body accelerating the coming of His Kingdom—and of loving anticipation of the joy and bliss of reunion with the dead in Christ in His rest and glory. Such words would also be in harmony with the desires and longings of Christian mourners, and would be

to them, what they have a right to ask, aministration of comfort.

Now, all these functions of the Church are provided for in her Order for the Burial of her Dead.

But when I say this, I am aware that the Clergy are exposed to great difficulties in the use of this Office, some arising from the failure of the provisions made to deprive certain persons of any title to these ministrations, and others arising from the nature of the case.

The rule of the Church, as stated in the Rubric, is that “the Office is not to be used for any that die unbaptised or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves;” but as there is no discipline, and the verdicts of *felo-de-se* are very rare, this law, excepting in the case of the unbaptised, is very ineffective, and the Clergy are constantly called upon to use the Office in the case of those for whom, as they may fear, it was not intended.

But there still remains the other class of difficulties against which no law can make any provision. The tares will ever grow up with the wheat—the many called cannot in most cases be separated from the few chosen. They who will be found to be last will often seem to us to be first. The worldly—the ungodly—those whose stunted growth seems to tell of secret sins—many of these must remain unchallenged claimants on the Offices of the Church, be her discipline ever so strict, and strictly enforced; and though it may often happen that such cases may, through the disguise which hides men from each other, cause

no scandal to the members of the Church, or raise scruples in the minds of the Clergy, it must still oftener be otherwise.

Often, very often, the clergyman must feel that however he endeavours to silence the voice of judgment, there is but little harmony between the triumphant tones of the Church and the evidences of a true conversion in the person whose body he is committing to the ground. He may, perhaps, know for certain that this person who might have been in the struggle with evil more than a conqueror through Him who loved him, knew whilst in health, nothing of such victories, and he may have received even in this same person's last illness only very weak evidences that he had at all recovered from such defeats, and was beginning to fight the fight of faith.

But I need not give any more instances of these difficulties and scandals. They are patent to all, and the sense of them has led to the suggestion of some remedies. I will remind you of some of them.

It has been proposed by some persons to have a second Office, which should express less hope and praise than our present Office, and which the Clergy might use at their discretion.

Others would revise our present Office and bring its tone down to the level of the proposed discretionary Office, or in other words adapt it more to the spiritual attainments of the generality of Christians.

Others would provide a partial remedy—one, namely, which would be applicable only to some cases of offence—by the restoration of discipline.

Others find for themselves, and suggest to their brethren some relief of their scruples, in the thought of the necessary imperfection of all human estimates —of the claims of all men for a charitable construction of their life—of the special claims of those who are departed this life for a considerate judgment—and of the natural clingings of the Christian heart to the reachings forth of God's hand of infinite mercy.

Others have satisfied themselves that there is already power lodged in the Bishops to protect any clergyman who might exercise a wise discretion with regard to what after all is a ministerial act, and not one of private opinion.

There is also one other remedy which I would mention, and it is this. It is very possible that the number of the cases of scruple and scandal would be very much reduced if we were more careful to make our zeal for the conversion of sinners, and the building up of believers during their life, a counterpart of our distress at not being able to exercise any discipline with regard to them after death.

Now, I think, that if these be the main difficulties of the case on the one hand, and the principal remedies which have been suggested on the other, the conclusion is quite clear that the question cannot be of the removal of all perplexities, but of the reducing them.

A discretionary service would be to all good men a most intolerable burden. The scruples which would be engendered by the exercise of such a

power, and by the dread of the temptation to any possible *προσωποληψία* under such circumstances would be most distressing.

And though the present trials of the Clergy in the use of our Office may be increased by what is thought to be the unduly high tone of its utterances, it should ever be remembered that as long as the service is a Christian service, it cannot fit the case of any but those who have departed in the true faith and love of God, and that, however discipline might clear away some causes of offence and scandal, it must leave many which would still tempt scoffers to mock, and the presumptuous to harden their hearts, and which would vex and harass those whose consciences were charged with a sense of responsibility about any misapplication of the service.

Supposing, then, for the sake of argument, that possibly the tone of our service is unnecessarily high, yet when I remember that no change can do more than alleviate scruples in some cases, and also that we are living in days of indifferentism, not to say of disaffection, towards exact theological statements, and when compromise, and what is called “breadth,” is in favour, and that we have had some incantious, but out-spoken warnings, that such changes would be accepted only as instalments, and as it is my conviction that any great changes would imperil the very existence of the Church as an establishment, you will not be surprised that I am most reluctant to enter upon a course which would, at best, only partially remove our present difficulties, and might

very likely involve us in others which would be yet more serious and hurtful.

There is, however, one remedial measure, that, namely, which is connected with your ministrations to the living, to which I would specially draw your attention.

Depend upon it, my Rev. Brethren, if the great mystery of the intermediate state, and the tremendous issues of the judgment in the everlasting punishment of the wicked and the everlasting reward of the good, had such a hold on our own imaginations and convictions, that we, the Clergy, were constrained by their influence never to cease our labour, our pains, and diligence, till the thoughtless and evil doers became, through God's grace, partakers of our own sense of responsibility, we should not only have less cause to complain that they who partook of the Church's Offices were unworthy of them, but we should also find it less difficult to refrain in a spirit of tender compassion for sinners from a severe, though, may be, true judgment of them.

But if those who have scruples about the present use of the Burial Office have drawn to ^{Subscription.} themselves much sympathy and provoked much discussion, so also have those who consider our system of subscriptions an undue infringement of the rightful liberty of the Clergy. And here I would say nearly what I said with regard to the Burial Office. I do not assert that our present system is perfect, nor do I deny that those who desire to get free from all restraints are wise in their gene-

ration to insist on changes, however slight, if there seems a plausible reason for them ; but I cannot understand how honest minds and hearts, who acknowledge the right of the Church to test the principles and creed of her teachers, can find adequate relief by altering, say improving, the form in which they express their declarations.

In such a matter a less stringency in the words of subscription cannot satisfy the scruples of a sensitive conscientious mind. Indeed, a *slight* change may, by the very *slightness* of the relief offered under the pressure of demand, only tend to augment such scruples, in the light thus thrown upon their real and unremoved cause. One effect, however, and a good one, of all such enquiry will, I believe, be that persons will be enabled more and more to appreciate the difficulty and risk of change, especially in an age which has only of late become familiar with the claims that religious truth has, as I have before said, for scientific treatment.

There is also another and a kindred subject on which there has been no little excitement, Book of Common Prayer. namely, the proposed alteration of the ^{mon} Prayer-Book—the curtailment of some of its Offices, and the modification of doctrine in others.

The plea urged for greater shortness is, I think, a most insufficient one. If it is urged on the ground alone of time and the power of attention, we have already many ways of satisfying that plea ; and if it is urged with an ulterior purpose—in order, namely, that through the door once opened for change, alte-

rations of doctrine may be introduced—I trust that all true lovers of the Church of England will steadily resist such an encroachment on their common inheritance; and I am the more encouraged to hope this by some of the words of that address to the two Primates from members of our Church who are supposed to differ very widely from one another, and to find their bond of union in the common recognition of the State, rather than in the similarity of their religious belief.

The words to which I allude are: “Our fervent prayer is that your Graces may be richly endowed with wisdom from on high, and may be enabled, with the other Primates and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, to take effectual counsel for the upholding, amidst the peculiar dangers of the present times, the divine authority of Holy Scripture, and the integrity of the faith, so that the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour may be taught in all its purity amongst ourselves, and handed on without diminution or addition to our children’s children.”

But on the other hand these words do not imply any disparagement of those other bonds of union, which, under circumstances of great difficulty have helped, in the good providence of GOD, to give strength to the Church of England.

In one of my letters to the Rural Deans I suggested to you, through them, considerations about the Act of Uniformity which implied my conviction that we ought to be very jealous of

any attempt to dispense with the safeguard which through it God has, in His goodness, provided for us. And my opinion is still unchanged. I believe that in God's good and merciful purposes towards us, that Act was, when passed (1662), a most powerful instrument for preventing all tampering with those who were external to our Church, and also a kind of framework for holding persons together who did not rise above the influences of the times in which they lived, and so did not estimate aright the value of other and better securities for unity.

With such convictions about the past services to us of the Act of Uniformity, I require very clear proof that we should be gainers by the withdrawal of it, before I can be a party to such a change.

And now, my dear Brethren, I have come to my conclusion, and my parting words to you Our Special Circumstances. will be to remind you of the special circumstances in which we are placed.

Every season of the Church's history has had its distinguishing characteristics, and so has the present, and we whose commission it is to bring everything into subjection to our Lord and Master, must ascertain what it is that opposeth itself to Him, that so understanding our duty we may seek and find grace to do it.

It is, I need hardly say, still, as it was in the days of our Lord, and as it has been ever since, the World against which the Church has to carry on its heavenly warfare. It is the Evil Spirit of the World

that we, the Ministers of Christ, are to cast out by the power of the Holy Spirit committed to us. And that I may make my meaning plainer, I will proceed to mention a few instances of the kind with which, as it is your lot to be brought into contact, so is it your business manfully to cope.

There is, then, such a thing as a disparagement of, and a disinclination towards theological study, owing in great measure to the excitement and absorbing interest of the great discoveries of physical science.

There is such a thing as a temper and even habit of mind, unfavourable to the uncompromising requirements of the Law of Christ, engendered by that indulgence of the desires of our animal nature which is ministered to them by the wonderful material progress of the age in which we live.

There is such a thing as an almost insatiable craving for something new in the field of knowledge in days “when men run to and fro, and knowledge is increased.”

There is such a thing as too great a readiness to sink differences, whether in politics or in religion, in order to avoid the social inconvenience of separation, as also to assume the bearing of a toleration, which places *feeling*, whether in ourselves or others, before the claims of God’s truth.

There is such a thing as to have one’s mind so fixed on the law and order, which confessedly mark God’s government of the world, as to discredit the truth of Divine interpositions, and so make it impos-

sible to find a place, with any consistency, for prayer to Him, whose will is thus regarded as inflexible.

There is such a thing as so to enlarge the limits of the duty of private judgment, as to give room for the opinion which denounces the tyranny of dogma and of a positive belief.

There is such a thing as an exaggerated, and, as I would urge, an unconstitutional assertion of the Royal supremacy which conveys a menace to the very existence of that authority to which is entrusted the preservation of the integrity of the faith.

There is such a confidence, both in the natural goodness of man, and in man's power to form himself after any pattern he may, on the strength of that goodness, devise for himself, as must make any system of education independent of the faith and discipline of the Church of God.

And even in the case of others who do not thus gainsay the truth of God in its bearings on man's nature, there may be a very repugnance to the doctrine of spiritual growth, and the presumptuous persuasion that those exceptional cases of late conversion, wherein God seems specially to vindicate the sovereignty of His will, and the exceeding abundance of His grace, do but represent the operations of an ordinary Law of His Kingdom, which dispenses with the work of repentance.

There is such a thing as a tendency in the minds of speculative men to eliminate from their creed God's attribute of justice, and to make benevolence, love, and mercy the sole principles of the Divine Government.

And these things do exist now. They are a part of the circumstances in which God has placed the Church of the present day to do the work which He has committed to her, and of which the Clergy have been called to be honoured instruments.

In your answers to my questions you have shewn, my Rev. Brethren, that you are aware that the difficulties in the midst of which you have to exercise your ministry are such as I have described to you, and I earnestly trust that you are resolved, by Gon's grace, to do battle with them, and to master them. But it is not enough to have the Spirit of Counsel to make good resolutions, but you must also have the Spirit of Wisdom to choose right ends, and the Spirit of Understanding to select right means for compassing those wisely chosen ends, and the Spirit of Ghostly Strength to fulfil those good, wise, and prudent resolutions, and these facts suggest the following warnings and directions.

Your work is not to be done by assuming an attitude of hostility, or even of unsympathising indifference to the onward march of civilization and the marvellous activities of the present generation.

It cannot be done by giving way to the influence of disparaging suspicions of the results of physical science.

It cannot be done by assailing with braggart language the august position of the Civil Power, and so exciting its jealousy, and by such challenge tempting it to drive the Spiritual Power, as it has

done elsewhere, to throw itself upon its own independent resources.^a

Nor, again, can it be done by harshly and roughly pushing those who imperfectly hold the Catholic faith into conclusions, to which they may indeed be logically drifting, but from which their hearts, by a merciful inconsistency, still shrink. No, it is not by any such mere antagonism to error that you must show that you are the salt of the earth, but by a discriminating appreciation of everything which is good in itself, and only evil through a perverted use of it.

If you would exercise your authority after St. Paul's example as well as rule, "for edification and not for destruction," you must not be content, for instance, to check the haste of worldly men in their pursuit of the objects of this world, but you must try so to take captive their energies, and train them when taken captive for a new service, as to persuade them to prefer that more excellent way, which lies in conformity to God's will, and obedience to His commandments.

You must not be satisfied with giving proofs, however clear, both of the emptiness of all vauntedings about the perfectibility of man and of the vanity of all hopes of unchecked progress from one degree of civilization to another, but you must endeavour to enlist on the side of our holy religion all desires and aims after excellence, by showing that the Gospel

^a Guizot's "L'Eglise et la Société," p. 96.

gives scope and direction to every high and noble instinct of humanity, and provides motives and means for the attainment of a holiness, in which the heroic among men, if it typified it, is far transcended, and for the realisation in actual life of those counsels of perfection which alone deserve that name.

If you would draw off the minds of men from the over engrossing interests of physical science, you must be able to place before them, with the power of those skilled in theology, the higher claims and better attractions of this far nobler because architectonic science.

But if this be so, who, you may well ask, is sufficient for these things, and how can such sufficiency be obtained?

My answer is, you can meet these claims upon you, if only you are faithful stewards of the good things which your GOD has, by His providence, committed to you. In the formularies of your Church, you will find the traditional witness of the Church of GOD to the truths of revelation, and in the Word of GOD you will find those proofs which will enable you to verify such teaching of the Church. "Give then," I beseech you, in the words of your ordination vow, "all faithful diligence so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of GOD," and endeavour to give like effect to your other engagement "to be diligent in reading of the Holy Scriptures and in such

studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh.”

Remember also that you have promised to be diligent in prayer, and that this obligation includes in a very special way within its wide limits a loyal and dutiful obedience to that wise law of the Church : “All Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause.”

And, lastly, my Rev. Brethren, take the greatest care not to give those to whom you have been called to minister occasion by your inconsistencies to disparage your ministry.

The Clergy must teach by example as well as by word. They who are sent to cast out the unclean spirits of the world, must exercise this power in casting out these spirits from themselves and their families, and so shew that they have “applied themselves, and that the Lord has helped them to frame and fashion their own selves and their families according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both themselves and their families wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ.”

And then, my Brethren, if you thus “consider the end of your ministry towards the children of God, towards the Spouse and Body of Christ;” if you thus do not “cease your labour, your care, your diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are committed to your charge unto that agreement

in the faith and the knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you either for error in religion or for viciousness of life ;” you will indeed have been found sufficient to fulfil the ends of that Ministry which has been appointed for the salvation of mankind.

Nay, and more, should you, in the course of your Ministry, find the question forced upon your souls by your trials and disappointments, “ When the Lord comes shall he find faith on the earth ?” and should you be led by the dark sayings of Holy Scripture to believe that during the time of the duration of the kingdom of grace the evil will become more evil, and the good a more perfect expression of God’s mind—that the struggles of the corrupted will of man with the will of God, as witnessed to in His Word, and developed in the course of His overruling providence, will be more and more intense, till the Righteous One and the evil one stand face to face in personal manifestation in the world—you will not be deterred by such a foresight from discharging your duties, but will find in this revelation of the present and future conflict, and its alternations of success and defeat, and the eventual triumph of the Church of God, an additional motive so to do battle for the truth, that in you the words of our Saviour’s charge and blessing may be alike fulfilled—“ Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord.” “ Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching.” Amen.

APPENDIX.

BENEFICED CLERGYMEN IN THE DIOCESE, WHO HAVE DIED SINCE AUGUST, 1861.

Name.	Benefice.
1861.	
Archdeacon Gunning	Buckland Newton.
Archdeacon Eliot	Norton Bavant.
1862.	
Archdeacon Maedonald.....	Bishops Cannings.
Thomas Henry Lane Fox...	Sturminster Newton.
James Moffat Harrington..	Chalbury.
William Dalby	Compton Bassett.
John Bastard.....	Fifehead Neville.
Hugh Hodgson	Idmiston.
Charles Robert Dampier ...	Bishop Caundle.
Thomas Wyndham	Pimperne.
Lewis Rew Cogan	Winsley.
Preelector Heatcote.....	Compton Bassett.
John William Dugdale	Kington Magna.
Richard Webb	Milston.
Charles Brodie Cooper	Hammoon.
George Lewes Benson	Vicar Choral of Salisbury Cathedral.
John Greenly	Vicar Choral of Salisbury Cathedral.
1863.	
Archdeacon Drury	Bremhill.
George Coke	Piddle Hinton.
William Cann	Kennet East.
Edward Brown	Monkton Farley.
Gregory Raymond.....	Symondsbury.
James Cottle, LL.D.....	Holy Trinity, Weymouth.
Frederic De Veil Williams	Wishford Magna.
Prebendary Edward Fane..	
Charles Edward North.....	Okeford Child.
William Harte	Blandford Forum.
John Morton Colson	S. Peter's, Dorchester.
Rowland Huyshe	Cheddington.
Edward Drury Butt	Melplaish.
Joseph Palmer Griffith.....	Norton Bavant.
Succentor Fisher	
1864.	
David Morgan	Ham.
Prebendary Moss King.....	More Critchill.
Henry George De Starek...	Fisherton Anger.
Edward Vincent	Rowde.
Charles Fox	Stoke East.
William Marshall	Chickerell West.
Richard Rowley	Maiden Bradley.
Carrington Ley	Beer Regis.

STATEMENT OF SERVICES, &c.

Number of Benefices
(Churches and Chapels) 472
563Pop. of Diocese, 1861 { Wilts, 173,405
Dorset, 182,193 } 355,598

CHURCHES.	SERVICES.	HOLY COMMUNION.						CONFIRMATIONS.			ORDINATIONS.		
		Holy Thursday.	Maundy.	Monthly.	Wednesday.	Holy Thursday.	Number of Communicants	Offertory Alms for the Poor.	Other Offertories and Collections in the year.	Number of in three years.	Catechumens Confirmed in three years.	Decrees in three years.	Presets in three years.
Consecrated in three years.	Restored in three years.	D.	S.	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1858	15	13	5	21	344	209	2	193	88	26,057	3970	11	3
1861	16	22	4	31	400	334	7	213	85	28,847	64616	8	6
1864	21	31	8	24	411	*325	9	258	100	27,619	65148	5	7
											65041	7	6
											67559	3	7
											217		
											207		
											12,842		
											219		
											12,559		
											12,460		

CHURCH UNION SOCIETY.	DIOCESAN CHURCH BUILDING SOCIETY.	POOR BENEFICE AUGMENTATION FUND.						DIOCESAN BOARD OF EDUCATION.							
		Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.	Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.	Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.	Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.	Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.	Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.		
Subscriptions for three years.	Donations for three years.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.		
1858	438	2	3	10	0	0	946	0	0	400	0	0	1081	9	6
1861	614	5	8	35	10	6	1285	10	6	1040	4	7	1065	10	10
1864	463	18	5	+555	0	0	1167	11	3	1133	18	6	468	1	0

* Possibly this decrease of Services on Holy Thursday may be accounted for by the inaccuracy of the returns.

† It has been found impossible to separate the money collected at the Offertory from that at other Services.

‡ Of this £500 were bequeathed by E. Fox, Esq., which have now been capitalised.

1861 a No return from 1861 b No return from 1861 c No return from

1864 29 parishes. 1864 65 parishes. 1864 65 parishes.

d Includes £299 4s. 2d. moiety of collection under Pastoral Letter. e Includes £215 15s. collected under Pastoral Letter. f Includes in my arrears. g Includes £66 4s. 7d. collected under Pastoral Letter. h Of this £500 were bequeathed by Rev. G. Raymond, £200 by E. Fox, Esq.

PASTORAL LETTERS.

DIOCESAN TRAINING SCHOOL STATISTICS.

Date.	Subject.	£	s.	d.	Sums collected.	
	Retirements.	X			made.	Received.
1862	Foreign Missions	350	10	56	£	s. d.
	a Dorchester Hospital	163	0	23		
1862	Lancashire Distress	261	50	52	6	18
1863	Poor Benefices Fund	264	74	5	7	0

MISSIONS.

Date.	S. P. G. in three years.	Church Missionary Society in three years.	Jews' Society in three years.
1858	81 57	66 59	13 9
1861	69 48	19 8	8 3
1864	87 86	12 7	7 27

PARISH SCHOOLS.

	1858.	1861.	1864.
Parishes in which Day Schools	406	64 49	451
Parishes in which Evening Schools	200	274	312

^a This Pastoral Letter was sent only to the Dorset Clergy.

^b This large sum is to be accounted for by the money given during those three years to *special Missions*.

^c This sum includes very probably that part of Wilts which is in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, a mistake which has been rectified in the figures for the last three years.

^d See Note c.

^e 1861, Inspectors' Return, 505 Day Schools } The only way in which this discrepancy can be accounted for is through the imperfect returns made under this head 1864, Inspectors' Return, 509 Day Schools } to the Bishop's Visitation queries.

SUPPLY OF SCHOOLMISTRESSES (TRAINED FOR TWO YEARS) FROM THE TRAINING SCHOOL.

	1861.	1862.	1863.	Diocese of Bath and Wells.	Diocese of Winchester.	Other Dioceses.
	1861	1862	1863	16	8	3
				12	8	3

^a Two Queen's Scholars left during the year.

^b Agrot. 1.

^c Agrot. 1; not eligible for Examination, 1.

93
Students or
their Patrons)

Date.	Queen's Scholars.	Number Classed for Certificates.	Government Grant for Students Classed at Christmas.	Total Government Grants in the year.	Cost of the Training School to the Diocese or Board of Education.	Fees paid by Students themselves or their Patrons.
1855	60	8	33	378 13 4	£ 633 6 8	£ 361 0 7
1856	58	29	10 { 20 scheduled ... 12 failed ... }	345 6 8	480 13 4	620 19 0
1857	58	51	33, 8 scheduled, 9 failed	424 0 0	749 1 8	334 17 8
1858	62	49	54, 1 scheduled, 2 failed	649 6 8	1206 0 0	266 16 8
1859	58	55	57 { none scheduled ... 1 failed ... }	681 6 8	1554 11 8	131 13 11 3
1860	62	56	62 { none scheduled ... none failed ... }	743 6 8	1637 11 8	201 13 4 1/2
			1 scheduled ... none failed ...	808 0 0	1827 1 8	311 1 8 1/2
			none scheduled ... none failed ...	807 6 8	1914 8 4	180 4 3
			none scheduled ... none failed ...	798 0 0	1920 16 8	...

CHURCHES CONSECRATED IN THREE YEARS.

To 1858.	To 1861.	To 1864.
Dorset 6	10	13 viz., at Charmouth Combe Keynes Athelhampton Bettiscombe Hawkchurch Kington Magna North Poortou Oborne Shipton Gorge Winterborne Houghton Woodsford Evershot (Chancel rebuilt) Fontmell Magna
Wilts 9	6	8 viz., at Great Bedwyn, S. Katharine Berwick S. John Chitterne Marlborough Cemetery Chapel South Newton Trowbridge S. Stephen Kennet East Pewsey Cemetery Chapel

15 16 21

CHURCHES RESTORED IN THREE YEARS.

To 1858.	To 1861.	To 1864.
Dorset 6	6	13 viz., at Cerne Abbas Frampton Langton Long, Blandford Melcombe Regis Beaminster Bredy, Long Castleton Edmondsham East Lulworth Blandford S. Mary Buckhorn Weston Cann S. Rumbold Caundle Bishop
Wilts 7	16	18 viz., at Woodborough Deverell Brixton Collingbourne Kingston North Newton Pewsey Stapleford Sutton Mandeville Wootton Rivers Bradley, North Cherhill Devizes S. John Lavington, Market Manningford Abbas Marlborough S. Peter Lyneham Fovant Little Langford Erchfont Wishford

13 22 32

WORKS IN PROGRESS FOR CHURCH BUILDING AND RESTORATION.

1. Alvediston
2. Aldbourne
3. Batcombe
4. Bradford-on-Avon
5. Bromham
6. Broadmayne
7. Cannings, Bishop
8. Calne
9. Chardstock
10. Codford S. Peter.
11. Compton Bassett
12. Dean, West
13. Fonthill Bishop
14. Gussage All Saints
15. Idmiston
16. Lulworth, West
17. Milton Abbas
18. Ogbourne S. Andrew
19. Ogbourne S. George
20. Okeford Fitzpaine
21. Parkstone
22. Radipole
23. Symondsbury (new Church)
24. Warminster (new Church)
25. Winterborne Earls
26. Winterborne Gunner
27. Westbury
28. Wool

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL INSPECTORS' PAPERS IN WILTS.—1861.

Rural Deaneries.	Inspectors.	Number of Schools.	Character of Schools.		Pupil Teachers.		Day Schools on Books.		Sunday Schools on Books.		Night Schools.		
			Good.		Moderate.		Male.		Female.		Boys.		
			Schools.		Inspec'ted.		Poor.		Rich.		Girs.		
<i>Archdeaconry of Sarum.</i>													
1. Wilton	{ Rev. Prebendary Payne { Rev. E. Hoskins	13	23	23	12	8	3	11	15	1059	1025	977	979
2. Amesbury, 1st Portion...	{ Rev. Prebendary Smart { Rev. T. D. C. Morse ...	12	15	15	8	3	4	8	5	485	565	316	343
3. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. E. Fowle	13	12	11	5	1	5	..	6	294	451	336	396
4. Chalke, 1st Portion	Rev. Chancellor Lear	22	16	15	3	9	3	1	5	389	580	464	429
5. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. C. Morgell	17	17	14	5	5	4	5	2	523	460	439	431
6. Wyls, 1st Portion	No Inspector Appointed ..	20	17	17	10	1	7	20	951	1389	1073	1130	17
7. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. W. D. Morrice.....	22	29	25	14	10	1	7	698
<i>Archdeaconry of Wilts.</i>													
8. Pottene, 1st Portion ..	Rev. Dr. Wilkinson	11	14	12	4	6	2	1	3	354	546	390	490
9. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. H. S. C. Crook	11	11	11	5	2	4	1	1	241	363	269	349
10. Ditto, 3rd Portion	{ Rev. Preb. Hastings ... { Rev. J. Wilkinson ...	21	29	24	12	11	1	9	19	1291	1338	997	1135
11. Avebury, 1st Portion ..	Rev. H. M. Fletcher	16	22	18	12	6	..	3	2	331	530	468	451
12. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. R. Nicholson	16	20	14	4	6	4	1	2	446	539	445	462
13. Marlborough, 1st Portion	Rev. Prebendary Popham ..	16	16	10	6	4	..	9	..	347	218	289	298
14. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. G. Stallard	15	15	7	4	3	..	7	3	518	383	312	369

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL INSPECTORS' PAPERS IN DORSET.—1861.

Rural Deaneries.	Inspectors.	Number of Benelees.	Schools. Instructed.	Character of Schools.	Pupil Teachers.	Day Schools on Books.	Sunday Schools on Books.	Night Schools.	Number of Schools.	
									Male.	Female.
<i>Archdeaconry of Dorset.</i>										
1. Bridport, 1st Portion...	{ Rev. Prebendary Foot Hon. & Rev. Preb. Scott }	13	6	4	4	2	2	54	54	54
2. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. A. Broadley	14	12	11	3	6	2	424	501	463
3. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. R. S. Hutchings	17	22	19	7	6	5	559	536	437
4. Ditto, 4th Portion	Rev. T. Sanctuary	13	13	12	5	4	3	359	336	386
5. Dorchester, 1st Portion	Rev. H. B. Williams	20	16	9	4	3	2	6	501	480
6. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Talbot Baker	16	20	16	5	7	4	7	14	739
7. Ditto, 3rd Portion	{ Rev. Prebendary Bond Rev. E. S. Banks	21	20	14	5	6	3	3	7	629
8. Pimperne, 1st Portion...	Rev. Prebendary Watts ...	17	13	12	7	4	1	3	7	491
9. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. J. H. Carnegie	17	21	16	7	5	4	2	8	590
10. Shaftesbury, 1st Portion	Rev. R. Barrett	13	10	9	5	2	2	1	6	527
11. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. W. Lyon	12	10	6	5	1	1	2	2	182
12. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. E. P. Grant	12	9	6	4	2	1	1	2	186
13. Ditto, 4th Portion	Rev. Prebendary Huxtable	12	11	8	3	3	2	1	2	251
14. Whitchurch, 1st Portion	Rev. G. L. Nash	16	14	7	3	4	4	4	266	378
15. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Precentor Heathcote	21	16	13	4	4	5	6	9	784
16. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. R. Burdon	10	7	6	5	1	2	1	121	160
17. Ditto, 4th Portion	Rev. E. A. Dayman	18	15	4	2	2	2	2	126	153

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL INSPECTORS' PAPERS IN WILTS.—1862.

97

Rural Deaneries.	Inspectors.	Number of Schools.	Character of Schools.		Pupil Teachers.	Day Schools on Books.	Sunday Schools on Books.	Grts.	Boys.	Grls.	Boys.	Grls.	Number of Schools.	Number of Scholars.	
			Good.	Bad.											
<i>Archdeaconry of Sarum.</i>															
1. Wilton	Rev. Prebendary Payne	15	23	11	10	1	10	16	1123	1155	925	938	10	394	
2. Amesbury, 1st Portion	{ Rev. Prebendary Smart Rev. Thomas Morse	16	16	15	6	7	2	6	3	444	500	313	375	9	193
3. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. J. N. Peill	13	13	11	4	2	5	...	7	293	440	356	384	10	297
4. Chalke, 1st Portion	Rev. Chancellor Lear	22	16	15	*
5. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. C. Morgell	17	18	16	7	6	3	2	1	597	576	540	540	7	177
6. Wiltshire, 1st Portion	Rev. C. Lawford	20	17	14	12	2	...	3	3	391	454	335	453	10	276
7. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Prebendary Morrice	22	23	14	18	1	3	18	1150	1274	920	996	17	598	
8. Potterne, 1st Portion	Rev. Dr. Wilkinson	12	14	12	2	9	1	1	3	325	527	254	319	4	110
9. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. H. S. C. Crook	11	12	9	5	4	...	1	1	281	359	286	365	5	115
10. Ditto, 3rd Portion	{ Rev. W. H. Jones	27	29	21	14	4	3	+
11. Avebury, 1st Portion	Rev. John Wilkinson	16	23	+	2	411	458	458	427	8	203
12. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. R. Nicholson	16	17	12	2	4	6	2	2
13. Marlborough, 1st Portion	{ Rev. Preb. Popham	15	14	9	7	1	1	5	1	263	332	206	254	5	147
14. Ditto, 2nd Portion	{ Rev. T. L. Kingsbury	16	21	8

* Returns made to the Bishop, but missing.
† No inspection from special circumstances.

‡ Incomplete Returns. Manager's Papers missing.
§ No inspection from resignation of Rural Dean.

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL INSPECTORS' PAPERS IN DORSET.—1872.

Rural Deaneries.	Inspectors.	Number of Schools.	Character of Schools.		Pupil Teachers.	Day Schools on Books.	Sunday Schools on Books.		Gifts.	Boys.	Girls.	Sundays Schools on Books.	Nights Schools.							
			Female.				Poor.													
			Good.	Moderate.			Male.													
<i>Archdeaconry of Dorset.</i>																				
1. Bridport, 1st Portion	Rev. Prebendary Foot	13	6	*	..	3	..	2	..	428	493	541						
2. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Prebendary Broadley	14	11	11	4	2	..	2	..	531	563	594	5	150						
3. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. R. S. Hutchings	14	21	17	8	—	9	3	1	594	631	594	6	241						
4. Ditto, 4th Portion	Rev. H. B. Williams	13	13	13	4	..	2	2						
5. Dorchester, 1st Portion	Rev. T. B. Baker	19	19	9	5	2	..	9	488	462	315	383	4	192						
6. Ditto, 2nd Portion	{ Rev. Prebendary Bond Rev. Eldon Bankes }	16	19	16	6	10	..	5	13	743	646	687	616	8						
7. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. Prebendary Watts	21	19	16	7	5	4	3	7	622	691	738	680	9						
8. Pimperne, 1st Portion	Rev. J. H. Carnegie	16	18	12	8	3	1	3	6	268	513	343	415	4						
9. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. R. Barrett	20	21	17	4	10	3	2	7	504	603	472	352	5						
10. Shaftesbury, 1st Portion	Rev. W. H. Lyon	14	11	10	6	2	2	1	10	509	517	526	629	6						
11. Ditto, 2nd Portion	{ Rev. Prebendary Grant Rev. E. P. Grant }	13	10	5	2	3	..	1	2	231	240	215	257	6						
12. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. H. T. Glyn	17	12	11	6	5	..	3	6	494	496	389	569	8						
13. Ditto, 4th Portion	Rev. G. L. Nash	14	12	8	6	2	..	1	249	261	195	251	1	12						
14. Witchchurch, 1st Portion	Rev. A. Wilkinson	16	14	9	4	3	2	..	3	285	401	246	249	5						
15. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. P. Prebendary Dayman	21	19	14	8	4	2	4	6	762	637	444	748	8						
16. Ditto, 3rd Portion	Rev. P. Prebendary Dayman	10	7	4	1	..	1	105	99	87	77	1						
17. Ditto, 4th Portion	Rev. P. Prebendary Dayman	15	16	3	2	..	1	..	1	45	..						

* No Returns

† No Returns from charge of Rural Dean.

‡ No Returns.

§ Returns incomplete.

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL INSPECTORS' PAPERS IN WILTS.—1863.

Rural Deaneries.	Inspectors.	Number of Schools.		Character of Schools.		Pupil Teachers.		Day Schools on Books.		Sunday Schools on Books.		Night Schools.			
		Good.	Bad.	Moderate.	Poor.	Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.	Boys.	Girls.	Boys.	Girls.		
<i>Archdeaconry of Sarum.</i>															
1. Wilton	Rev. Prebendary Payne	14	24	*	...	7	18	1274	1093	1072	902	11	334		
2. Amesbury, 1st Portion	{ Rev. Prebendary Smart Rev. Thomas Morse	16	15	15	8	4	2	543	599	425	325	10	207		
3. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. J. N. Peill	13	12	12	4	3	5	276	397	392	392	11	261		
4. Chalke, 1st Portion	Rev. Tupper Carey	22	20	14	5	5	4	6	470	597	468	537	12	324	
5. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Charles Tower	16	18	16	10	5	1	1	508	512	508	501	9	241	
6. Wyke, 1st Portion	Rev. Charles Lawford	20	17	16	9	6	1	3	380	528	501	494	9	272	
7. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Prebendary Morrice	22	29	10	17	2	1	10	1439	1187	1052	1293	26	926	
<i>Archdeaconry of Wilts.</i>															
8. Potterne, 1st Portion	Rev. Dr. Wilkinson	12	14	13	2	5	6	1	3	361	536	310	470	6	263
9. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. H. S. C. Crook	12	11	10	4	5	1	1	...	255	328	245	249	7	163
10. Ditto, 3rd Portion	{ Rev. W. H. Jones	†	
11. Avebury, 1st Portion	{ Rev. E. Peacock	16	23	10	8	2	...	2	389	450	347	331	5	147	
12. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. H. M. Fletcher	16	17	17	11	6	...	1	1	476	523	513	473	8	244
13. Marlborough, 1st Portion	Rev. B. C. Dowding	†	6	4	587	509	440	413	2	...
14. Ditto, 2nd Portion	Rev. Prebendary Stanton	16	21	19	14	14	5	31	31

* Inspection omitted from illness.

† Inspection omitted.

‡ Inspection omitted from change of Rural Dean.

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL INSPECTORS' PAPERS IN DORSET.—1863.

Rural Deaneries.	Inspectors.	Number of Schools.	Character of Schools.		Pupil Teachers.	Day Schools on Books.	Sunday Schools on Books.	Night Schools.
			Boys.	Girls.				
<i>Archdeaconry of Dorset.</i>								
1. Bridport, 1st Portion...	Rev. Prebendary Foot	12	9	*	2	5	2	...
2. Ditto, 2nd Portion.....	Rev. Prebendary Broadley	14	11	11	4	2	422	438
3. Ditto, 3rd Portion.....	Rev. R. S. Hutchings	14	20	18	6	3	1	470
4. Ditto, 4th Portion.....	Hon. and Rev. Spring Rice	14	9	4	431	414
5. Dorchester, 1st Portion	Rev. H. B. Williams	19	18	9	1	..	280	360
6. Ditto, 2nd Portion.....	Rev. T. B. Baker	16	19	18	5	7	6	490
7. Ditto, 3rd Portion.....	{ Rev. Prebendary Bond { Rev. Eldon S. Banks }	21	19	14	6	7	1	475
8. Pimperne, 1st Portion...	Rev. Prebendary Watts	16	14	9	5	3	3	347
9. Ditto, 2nd Portion.....	Rev. J. H. Carnegie	20	21	17	4	8	5	374
10. Shaftesbury, 1st Portion	Rev. R. Barrett	14	13	10	3	6	1	493
11. Ditto, 2nd Portion.....	Rev. W. H. Lyon	13	9	5	2	3	1	525
12. Ditto, 3rd Portion.....	Rev. E. P. Grant	17	12	9	2	4	3	232
13. Ditto, 4th Portion.....	Rev. H. T. Glyn	14	12	9	5	4	1	146
14. Whitechurch, 1st Portion	Rev. G. L. Nash	16	14	9	3	5	3	405
15. Ditto, 2nd Portion.....	Rev. A. Wilkinson	21	19	15	7	2	7	493
16. Ditto, 3rd Portion.....	Rev. C. W. Bingham	11	11	7	2	5	...	606
17. Ditto, 4th Portion.....	Rev. R. Watts	17	16	8	8	...	1	179
						...	212	152
						...	294	146
						1	367	275
						...	318	398
						1	644	734
						...	121	131
						1	179	204
						...	315	345

* Returns omitted from illness.

† Incomplete Returns from appointment of new Rural Dean.

THE DIOCESAN SCHOOL PRIZE SCHEME.

The Diocesan School Prize Scheme has just issued its fifth report. From this it appears that a very appreciable improvement has taken place in the work of the Candidates, the results of the Examinations during the last four years having been brought to the test of figures.* The per centages of increased success and of diminished failure, as compared with the numbers of competitors, both bring out very clearly the fact of marked progress. The comparison of the last two years shews that, whereas in 1863 the per centage of the first class (the highest honour) to the attending children was, among the boys, 13.3, and among the girls 8.9, the figures have this year mounted up to 28.2 and 26.0 respectively. Again, whereas the figures representing the per centage of failures were last year 32.5 for boys, and 23.1 for girls, they have this year fallen to 15.1 and 13.5. The instructions to the Examiners for marking the papers having been the same, and the standard having been unaltered during the period in which these comparisons are made, the only reasonable explanation of the improvement is, that the Scheme is working satisfactorily in promoting careful instruction which will stand the test of a searching examination.

And thus the Scheme appears to be realising that which its warm promoter and the Chairman of its Committee, the Dean of Salisbury, has more than once pointed out as its distinctive feature, viz., that it is an Examination rather than a Prize Scheme—a means of testing the teaching given in our Parochial Church Schools, and of giving a definite aim and method to the instruction, without any extension or alteration of the usual subjects, rather than a plan for the distribution of prizes. The Scheme desires to

* The following Table shows, during the five years of the Scheme's working, in a comparative manner, the number of places which sent in Candidates, the number of Candidates named in the certificates, the number actually attending the Examination, the per centage of those who obtained places in the first class, or of those who failed, to the number attending :—

Places.	Candidates.	Attended.	Per Centage		Per Centage	
			B.	G.	B.	G.
1860— 54	360 282	312 254				
	642	566				
1861— 77	425 410	353 354	12.4	8.2	22.1	27.1
	835	707				
1862— 84	610 485	493 397	9.2	5.6	27.8	23.1
	1095	890				
1863— 70	471 398	382 347	13.3	8.9	32.5	23.1
	869	729				
1864— 67	419 394	351 334	28.2	26.0	15.1	13.5
	813	685				

act the same part and to fulfil the same duties towards our elementary schools, as the universities of Oxford and Cambridge do towards the Middle and Grammar Schools. It is, in fact, an adaptation of the University system of Local Examinations.

“ Quiconque croit vraiment en Dieu compte sur la Providence. Dieu n'est pas un expédient inventé pour expliquer le premier fait, un acteur appelé pour ouvrir, par la création, la scène du monde, et relégué ensuite dans une complète inutilité, et inertie. Par cela seul qu'il est, Dieu assiste à son œuvre et la maintient. La Providence, c'est le développement naturel et nécessaire de l'existence de Dieu ; c'est la présence constante et l'action permanente de Dieu dans la création.”—M. Guizot's “Médiations sur l'Essence de la Religion Chrétienne,” p. 30.

EXTRACT FROM LAST CHARGE.

“ There was much indeed to dissuade me from acting as I have done. In the first place it is my belief, with regard not only to this one Essay but to the whole volume, that there is not power enough in it to exercise a permanent influence over the minds of men. This, then, was one cause for hesitation. Secondly, I am not myself free from the fear, which many feel most keenly, that legal proceedings will very possibly for a time extend and intensify that influence, whatever it may be. Thirdly, I do not think that the constitution of our Courts of Judicature is as well fitted, as one could desire, for weighing in the fine balances of Truth the many questions which will through such proceedings be necessarily submitted to them.

There are also, on the same side, and so a fourth cause of hesitation, the dictates of a righteous caution lest any feelings of indignation at what has appeared to many, and to myself amongst that number, a reckless and ruthless attempt to pull down the whole fabric of Christian Doctrine to its very foundations, should make me forget the claims of justice, and fair dealing, and charity. And I may further add, that I was also checked in coming to the decision which I have taken by the thought that the alarming tokens of combined action, and zeal, and earnestness might have led me, in my fears, to exaggerate the danger, and not to give due heed to the warnings of discretion, and of calm unswerving confidence in the power of Truth.

I frankly admit that there were these difficulties in the way of my determining to institute legal proceedings. But there were, on the other side, many weighty, and to my mind preponderating considerations in favour of my submitting the Essay to the Court of the Archbishop, and of thus trying to show that the Church of England disallowed its teaching.

For example, however comprehensive may be the limits within which our tolerant Church allows her Clergy to exercise their ministry, those limits must exist somewhere. Again, as a Bishop, I accepted at the time of my Consecration the responsibility of keeping the teaching of my Clergy within these wide limits. Thirdly, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England have testified by a public record that those limits have been in their opinion transgressed, and the Lower House of Convocation and my own Clergy have given in their adhesion to this testimony ; and such united expression of opinion has helped to press the conclusion on my mind, that the case was beyond the bounds of Toleration, and has quickened my sense of responsibility about it.

It is also to be noted that, upon the writers of the Essays, these recorded decisions have been utterly without effect. The authors of them have, by the repeated subsequent publication of their Book, persisted in challenging us to shew that such opinions as they have put forth are inconsistent with the position given by the Law of the Church of England to her Ministers. I might almost say that the writers have, by such conduct, seemed themselves to protest against informal action, and to demand, in the name of justice, the formal judgment of those Courts to which the decision of such questions in this country now belongs. Nor is it any valid answer to such an appeal from informal judgments to a formal one, to say that the instruments which the Church can use in the Courts of Law are not those which Theologians would, in all respects, trust. This may be so, but still there is no denying that they are those with which alone GOD has, in His good Providence, provided us for the defence of His Truth, and the consequence of my not using them, and so of doing nothing formally and according to Legal sanction with regard to this Essay, might be that our children would inherit the conclusion that such teaching, though possibly most repugnant to the religious sentiments of their fathers, was, in 1861, admitted to be not unlawful. The thought of being responsible for such impunity, and so for an admission which may be made hereafter to justify scepticism, and, what is worse, in Members of our Church, is a very intolerable burden upon any one on whom it may fall.

I can also bear witness for myself that the sense of the claims of loyalty to my Church, and the fear of being cowardly unfaithful to my trust, must have been very strong to subject to them my convictions that conciliation and forbearance, and hope, are the common paths of that faith which worketh by love, and that they who are clothed with such responsibilities as mine will, with rare exceptions, find the wisest, safest, and most effectual guidance in the words of an ancient Father, *δὺ μὴν ὅνδε παντελῶς, μοι δοκεῖ τῶν μὴ δεχομενῶν τὴν πίστιν ἀλλοτριοῦν ἔαντούς, ἀλλα ποιήσασθαι τίνα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπιμέλειαν κατὰ τὸν παλαιοὺς Θεομόν τῆς ἀγάπης.*²

ANSWER TO ADDRESS OF DORSET CLERGY.

Palace, Salisbury, 4th June, 1863.

MY DEAR ARCHDEACON,

I will, according to your request, forward to the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland the address which you, and the Clergy of your Archdeaconry, have agreed to make to them with regard to the discussions in which the Bishop of Natal has, from the circumstances of his position, become so notorious, and I am sure that all these your Fathers in God will receive the address, with the same feelings with which I, as Bishop of this Diocese, have welcomed it.

I am, indeed, satisfied that the faithful who have received the teaching of the Church with regard to the Bible, and so have learnt to reverence and love the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, as God's written word, have no craven fears about the issue of this controversy; but I also know that they must at the same time have their hearts stirred with those anxious thoughts which are alone commensurate with the many momentous questions to which answers are demanded. And if this is the case with all the other members of the Church, so must it be especially the case with her Bishops. We have, I trust, our share of that holy confidence which I have spoken of as the portion of the faithful; but we, above all men, ought to feel the full weight of that burden of anxiety which is now pressing upon Christian minds and hearts, and to men thus circumstanced your expressions of filial confidence and regard are very seasonable and assuring.

But there is also more than this in your address to cheer us. When I read your declaration, with regard to the witness borne to Holy Writ by the Church which is its keeper, I remember that it is in exact harmony with the convictions expressed by the great body of the Clergy of the Church of England, and I am reminded that if we have in these days our special trials, we have also cause to thank God both for such united loyalty to the faith and for making the season of a common danger the occasion of so strengthening the bonds of Christian love as to make us *one* in our defence of our priceless inheritance.

I will only now add my assurance that I will not cease to pray that we may be all more and more joined together in communion with our blessed Lord, and that I am, my dear Archdeacon,

Your affectionate friend and brother,
W. K. SARUM.

The Venerable Archdeacon Sanctuary.

LETTER TO THE ARCHDEACONS OF THE DIOCESE.

Palace, Salisbury, Easter Week, 1864.

MY DEAR ARCHDEACONS,

I have received Addresses numerously signed by the Clergy of your Archdeaconries; and as there is, I am glad to say, much common to all these Addresses, both in the profession they contain of disagreement with the opinions, which, according to the late judgment, the Clergy of our Church may hold and teach without incurring legal penalties, and also in the expression of feelings of confidence in, and of consideration for me, I shall acknowledge them all in this one letter, and trust to you to communicate my answer to those of my Clergy who have signed them.

I am very thankful to know that so many of my Brethren have not misconstrued or disapproved my conduct in this very painful matter, and that they still justify the measures which I thought it my bounden duty to take for the honour of the Church, and for the protection of my Diocese.

The following statement will, I trust, tend to strengthen them in this conviction:—

When I had carefully read the Review of Baron Bunsen's Biblical Researches, I satisfied myself that it contained forty-three passages at variance either with the direct words of our Lord Himself, or with the plain words of Holy Scripture, or with the Formularies of our Church, and that of these forty-three passages thirty-three contained statements of the Reviewer's own opinions, while ten reproduced those of Baron Bunsen, which, however, were marked by the approval of the Reviewer.

I am not now speaking of the passages which were subsequently admitted by my legal advisers into the Articles filed against the Reviewer, but of that much larger body of language contained in the Review, which although, as it seemed, beyond the cognizance of the Law, could not but have great moral weight in determining my own judgment, as to the course, which under the circumstances, I might be bound in conscience, however reluctantly, to pursue.

I was indeed most reluctant, both on public and private grounds, to bring a charge of heretical teaching against the writer, and in consequence I readily persuaded myself to put off my decision till I had had an opportunity of advising with the Primate and my Right Rev. Brethren. At the same time I did not forget that as the seeming offence was committed by one of my own Clergy I ought not to attempt to divest myself of my liberty of action and of my really inalienable responsibility with regard to what was in my opinion "erroneous and strange Doctrine contrary to God's word."

The result of the meeting of the Bishops was the publication of a rescript of the two Archbishops and twenty-four Bishops of the

two Provinces of York and Canterbury to one of my Rural Deans, the Rev. H. Williams.

In this letter, to which, in view of my possible duties, I had most unwillingly appended my name, the Members of the Church were informed that the question which was then receiving the gravest consideration by the Archbishops and twenty-four other Bishops was, "whether the language in which these views are expressed is such as to make their publication an act that could be visited in the Ecclesiastical Court, and to justify the Synodical condemnation of the Book which contains them." Soon after the promulgation of this letter, the Chancellor of my Diocese, and another very eminent Lawyer, advised me that one of the writers, the Reviewer of Baron Bunsen's Biblical Researches, had brought himself within reach of the general Law Ecclesiastical and also of the Statute of Elizabeth. Finding then that my own estimate of the Book was confirmed by that of a very large body of my Right Rev. Brethren, and having by the opinion of my legal advisers solved one part of the question which embarrassed the decision of the Archbishops and Bishops, I felt that if I did not challenge the soundness of the statements in the Essay I have alluded to, I should be evading a plain duty, against the discharge of which my conscience could suggest no motive more serious than the dread of an unsuccessful issue.

Having made up my mind to endeavour by legal proceedings to restrain one of my Clergy from openly proclaiming what I could not but consider to be Heresy, I further determined not to hear and try the case in my own Court under the provisions of the Church Discipline Act, but to cause my Office to be promoted against Dr. R. Williams in the Arches Court of Canterbury, and to send the case by letters of request to be heard and tried there at once, and I also resolved not to institute proceedings under the 13th of Elizabeth. For, having appended my name to the letter of the Archbishop, I thought it more advisable not to hear and try the case myself, and I much preferred to proceed under the general Law of the Church, by which the Defendant, if found guilty, would not be deprived of a *locus penitentiae*, as he would have been by the Statute of Elizabeth. Under this Law the proceedings were conducted.

The case thus sent by letters of request to the Arches Court of Canterbury was argued before the Dean of the Arches, the Right Honourable Stephen Lushington, D.C.L. Of the thirteen Articles of charge the Judge admitted only four; he required two others to be reformed, and rejected seven. This decision was not in form, as it was in fact, a judgment upon the merits of the case; and the Judge at this point, after delivering this interlocutory judgment, and before he pronounced sentence, gave either or both parties leave to appeal to her Majesty in Council.

I had no hesitation in declining to be the appellant, as I had

always entertained the strongest objections to the constitution of the present Court of Final Appeal, and so also when the formal judgment was given on December 15, 1862, and an appeal against it was lodged by the Defendant, and I had to consider what course I should adopt, my conviction about the constitution of the Court of Appeal determined me to do no more than endeavour to maintain Dr. Lushington's judgment.

It was at this time open to me, by appealing to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, to endeavour to re-open the whole case—or by adhering to the appeal to seek for what might have seemed to be a more adequate punishment for the offence committed—or simply to endeavour to maintain against Dr. Williams' appeal the sentence of the Archbishop's Court.

I determined upon the last-named course. I have already explained to you why I shrank from the first of these courses. The second course was open in some degree to the same objection, and, moreover, I did not wish merely to question the adequacy of the Punishment.

It is very possible, I am aware, that a doubt may arise in some minds whether I ought not, in prudence, to have abstained from trying in a Court of Law opinions which I deemed unsound, if I was conscious of any scruples which would prevent me from appealing from the interlocutory judgment, and which would thus secure to an offender who should appeal, at a later time, the very great advantage of having to meet fewer Charges, and so a narrower range of argument. My answer must be, that I could not control the circumstances under which I had to act. To have done nothing would have been to acknowledge that the Church of England had no Discipline whatever, and no adequate sense of what is due to revealed Truth and to the souls of men. Therefore I felt under an obligation to carry the matter to the Archbishop's Court. But I felt equally bound in conscience not to be the appellant under any circumstances to the present Court of Final Appeal.

With regard to the judgment which has been given by this Court, I observe, with satisfaction, that you abstain in your Addresses from expressing any opinion as to its legal value. Still it would be improper not to notice that the Archbishops of both Provinces, who sat not as assessors but as Members of the Court, dissented from the judgment, and that this fact, whatever its consequences may be, is without precedent in our history.

One possible, and as I trust most probable, consequence is that there will be a readjustment of this Appellate Jurisdiction, and that such a change will recognise and embody the principle of the Preamble of the great Statute of 1532, viz.:—That the Spirituality of England is “sufficient and meet of itself without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.”

And to my mind the hope of this result derives much of its strength from the increased influence which the Clergy have gained of late years by their greater faithfulness to the duties of their calling, and by the increased interest of the laity in all things affecting our Holy Religion.

Nor do I, in speaking of the faithfulness of the Clergy, forget that many of my brethren have in their Address renewed to me their pledge that they will "faithfully adhere to the doctrines of the Church, and with all diligence devote themselves to the work of the Ministry," and that "they will never cease to offer their prayers to God to guide and to help me." Such assurances might seem to make it less necessary for me to reassert those Blessed Truths which have been called in question; and I am relieved from the necessity of making any elaborate statement on the subject by the Pastoral Letter which the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury owe to our venerated Primate, and by which His Grace has commanded the heartfelt gratitude of the Church at large. Unreservedly accepting the Doctrinal Statements of that Letter, I would affectionately recommend them, together with the exhortations that accompany them, to the Clergy of my Diocese.

May GOD of His great mercy bless my Brethren for strengthening my hands, and encouraging my faint heart; and may He, through their prayers, so pour down upon me the Spirit of Counsel and Ghostly Strength, that I may be able to stimulate and cherish their good endeavours to "strengthen the bonds of union" amongst all classes in my diocese, and myself become increasingly anxious to protect those committed to my charge from all such doctrine as is at variance with the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I remain, my dear Archdeacons,
Your affectionate Friend and Brother,
W. K. SARUM.

The Venerable the Archdeacons of Dorset,
Sarum, and Wilts.

"Il faut que l'Eglise soit intacte, et libre dans son domaine comme l'état dans le sien."—M. Guizot's "L'Eglise et la Société," p. 68.

"Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les 'y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Eglise d' Angleterre."—Count de Maistre's "Considerations sur la France," ch. ii.

"C'est toute l'Eglise Chrétienne en effet, et non pas telle ou telle des églises Chrétiniennes, qui est maintenant et radicalement attaquée. Quand on nie le surnaturel, l'inspiration des Livres saints, et la divinité de Jesus Christ, c'est sur tous les Chrétiens Catholiques, Protestants, ou Grecs, que portent les coups, c'est à tous les

Chrétiens, quels que soient leurs dissensments particuliers et les formes de leur gouvernement ecclésiastique, qu'on enlève les bases de leur foi. Et c'est par la foi que vivent toutes les églises Chrétiennes ; il n'y a point de forme de gouvernement, monarchique ou républicaine, concentrée ou éparse, qui suffise à maintenir une église ; il n'y a point d'autorité si forte, point de liberté si large que, dans une société religieuse, elle puisse tenir lieu de la foi. Ce sont les *âmes* qui s'unissent dans une église, et c'est la foi qui est le lien des âmes. Quand donc les fondements de leur foi commune sont attaqués, les dissidences entre les églises Chrétiennes sur des questions spéciales, ou les diversités de leur organisation et de leur gouvernement deviennent des intérêts secondaires ; c'est d'un péril commun qu'elles ont à se défendre ; c'est la source commune où elles puissent toutes la vie qu'elles sont menacées de voir tarir."— M. Guizot's "Médiations sur l'Essence de la Religion Chrétiennes," Preface p. ix.

MISSION HOUSE STATISTICS.

Since the establishment of the Mission House, 18 Students have been admitted, of these 6 have passed on from us, and are undergoing elsewhere further training for Missionary work ; 3 at St. Augustine's, 1 at Islington, 1 at Codrington College, 1 at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Nine are still with us, and three have failed, and of these three, one was a Malay, of whom I had never any hope, and another of the three is still earnestly bent on being a Missionary, so we have reason to thank GOD for the success He has been pleased to vouchsafe us. The three at St. Augustine's are, we hear, doing most satisfactorily, as also is our Islington Student. Of the eighteen, nine have been more or less assisted by Rural Deanries of this Diocese.

£244 7s. have been raised towards the purchase fund of the House. £1100 is the sum required.

LETTER FROM REV. PREBENDARY PAYNE.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am afraid that your Lordship may not have been prepared for such a volume as I now send, when you asked me to write you a letter on the subject of the great Diocesan, Charities, and it is not without some reluctance, lest I should appear presumptuous, that I venture to submit the accompanying scheme for your Lordship's consideration and amendment, should your Lordship think it worth the trouble of amending.

Your Lordship may remember that I did not originally recommend relying upon local action, chiefly because I think persons generally dislike applying to their neighbours, and the possibility of jealousies arising between different subdivisions, &c., &c. How-

ever, there is clearly a concurrence of opinion in favour of local action, and I am quite ready to admit that, *if* it is zealously carried out by fit men, no other will be equally effective. We will hope, therefore, for this result. I think it is essential that all who *collect* subscriptions, should have a voice in their disbursement; persons will not trouble themselves to collect money for others to spend; and, therefore, I am not sanguine in obtaining local aid in the matter of collecting, unless the collectors are admitted into the *spending* body.

The proposed scheme may seem a very radical reform of all existing proceedings, and perhaps it is a more extensive one than I originally contemplated in some respects, still if separate local action and united central action are to be combined, I do not see how it is to be effected with less change, and, after all, perhaps it is not so much as it might at first sight appear. I do not think that it would be wise to admit more than the four objects mentioned into the scheme; but at the same time we must be prepared to have the claims of others to the like distinction advanced, and meet, perhaps, with some opposition on the ground of their exclusion. If they were admitted, we should have but little improved our condition, and should be continuing to rub against each other until we rub each other to pieces. What is chiefly necessary is this--to put certain objects on a pedestal, as it were, that persons who are too idle to look into matters for themselves, and now very often settle the question by giving to none, should know the objects which have the strongest claim upon them. Of course, the light thrown upon these objects will have the effect, in some degree, of putting the others into shade. That cannot be helped; the one is a necessary consequence of the other.

If your Lordship was an autocrat, and adopted my view, the transition from our present mode of action to the one proposed would really be very simple. It would be simply to direct the Rural Deans to call a meeting of the subscribers in their different deaneries, appoint the officers mentioned, &c., and then summon a meeting of the Diocesan Board to fulfil their part.

I remain, my dear Lord, your Lordship's very faithfully,

RICHARD PAYNE.

Downton, Jan. 19, 1864.

Suggestions for carrying on the business of the Church Union--the Church Building Society--the Diocesan Education Society, and the Small Benefice Augmentation Fund in the Diocese of Salisbury, on a uniform and united plan.

I. Rural-Decanal Boards to be formed of all subscribers to any of the above-mentioned objects resident in the rural deanery, which shall meet not less than once in every year as early as possible, and oftener if required, upon the summons of the Rural Dean or collectors for the following purposes especially:—

1. To make any rules for their own guidance and regulation, which may not be inconsistent with such as shall be made by the Diocesan Board.

2. To appoint a Collector whose duty it shall be

(a) To collect all donations and subscriptions from persons resident within his district or connected therewith, provided such person be not resident in any other district within the Diocese, and also to take care that all persons so circumstanced, who do not subscribe, and seem able so to do, should be applied to for aid, and have reports from time to time furnished to them, &c.

(b) To keep his accounts in some such form as that subjoined in Form No. 1.

(c) To transmit money from time to time to the different Diocesan Treasurers of these Funds.

(d) To repay himself by rateable proportions any incidental expenses he may have incurred.

(e) to have his accounts audited by the Ruri-Decanal auditor as soon after Michaelmas as may be, and transmit a copy to the General Diocesan Secretary, to be embodied in the Diocesan report.

3. To appoint a Ruri-Decanal auditor who shall every year audit the accounts of his rural deanery.

4. To appoint two persons in addition to the Rural Dean to attend and vote at meetings of the Diocesan Boards, of whom the Collector, if not the Rural Dean, should be one, and the Rural Dean or persons so appointed, if prevented from attending the Diocesan Board, should be allowed by their own authority to appoint any other member of the Ruri-Decanal Board to attend such meeting as their proxy.

N.B. At this meeting of the Ruri-Decanal Board, a great many of the subscriptions would be paid with very little trouble.

II. That a Diocesan Board be formed consisting of the Bishop, the Archdeacons, and members appointed by the Ruri-Decanal Boards, with power to add to their number, whose duty it shall be

1. To hold quarterly meetings on fixed days, as the Diocesan Education Society now does.

2. To appoint sub-committees when necessary, for overlooking especial objects, such as the training school, sanctioning reports, &c., and at the quarterly meetings for the greater dispatch of business should it be found necessary.

3. To make all rules, bye-laws, grants, &c.; in fact, to transact all the business now done by the different committees of these four Societies.

4. To appoint one Diocesan Secretary and one or two Treasurers for each of the four societies, whose duties would be much the same as at present, with these exceptions, that they would have no trouble with *individual* subscribers, and the treasurer would only recognise the gross sums received from the different rural deanries (as may be seen in Form No. 2 for his accounts), and the

secretary, instead of calling meetings himself, would a month before each fixed quarterly meeting forward to the General Diocesan Secretary an agenda paper of the business he had to bring forward; at the end of the year they would send their report to him, and a statement of accounts, verified by the Diocesan auditor, to be incorporated in the Diocesan report.

5. To appoint a Diocesan auditor, who shall audit the accounts of the Diocesan Treasurers, and also that of the General Diocesan Secretary.

6. To appoint a General Diocesan Secretary, whose duty it shall be

(a) To embody in one form the agenda papers of the different secretaries, to get it printed and circulated to all members of the Diocesan Board, at least one week before the day of meeting.

(b) To keep the Ruri-Decanal collectors supplied with all necessary printed forms, such as account-books, receipt-books, forms of application for subscribers, and non-subscribers, &c.

(c) Superintend the publication and issue of the general report, &c.

(d) To defray as far as possible all common expenses, and charge them to the treasurers of the different societies who will repay him when his accounts are audited by the Diocesan auditor.

FORM I.

Rural Deanery of Wilton.	Church Union.	Dio. Church Building Society.	Diocesan Education Society.	Small Bene fice Aug. Fund.
A B -	£ 10 0 0	£ 3 0 0	£ ...	£ 5 0 0
C D -	1 1 0
E F -	*2 2 0	1 0 0	3 3 0
G H -	5 0 0	1 1 0	10 0 0
I J -	3 0 0	10 0 0
K L -	1 1 0	*0 10 0	*0 10 0	2 0 0
M N -	5 0 0	. .	1 0 0	3 0 0
O P -	2 2 0	2 0 0	0 10 0
Q -	0 10 0	1 1 0	1 0 0	2 2 0
<hr/>				
		18 13 0	15 13 0	25 15 0
Arrears -	1 1 0	0 10 0	1 0 0	2 2 0
<hr/>				
Total received	17 12 0	15 3 0	15 12 0	23 13 0

* The sums with an asterisk are Donations.

CHURCH UNION ACCOUNT.

Received ... £17 12 0	Expenses £0 10 0
	Remitted to Dio. Treas. 15 0 0
	In hand 2 2 0
	£17 12 0

DIOCESAN CHURCH BUILDING.

Received ... £15 3 0	Expenses £0 5 0
	Remitted to Dio. Treas. 14 0 0
	In hand 0 18 0
	£15 3 0

FORM II.

DIOCESAN CHURCH BUILDING TREASURERS' ACCOUNT.

Received from—				
A Rural Deanery - £40 16 0	Grant to A -	-	£100 0 0	
B Rural Deanery - 14 0 0	„ B -	-	60 0 0	
C Rural Deanery - 25 5 0	„ C -	-	90 0 0	
D Rural Deanery - 19 10 0	Expenses -	-	4 5 0	
E Rural Deanery - 150 8 0	Share of Gen. Expen.	-	7 10 0	
F Rural Deanery - 72 6 0	Balance -	-	60 10 0	
Total - £322 5 0			£322 5 0	

Each treasurer a similar account.

The General Diocesan Secretary would have to pay for all printing for general purposes, postages, &c.

SUBJECTS SUBMITTED TO RURI-DECANAL CHAPTERS.

1861.

1. Is it desirable to give a more defined place in the system of the Church to the ministrations of Women in Works of Christian Charity, and if so, under what restrictions should such functions be exercised?

2. Is it expedient to alter the 29th Canon, and if so what alterations should be made in it?

3. The Law of Dilapidations.

4. The New Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education.

1862.

1. Can anything be safely attempted to bring under rule and order, and so to authorise the services of Laymen, especially on the Lord's Day, in the Ministry of the Word?

2. The present circumstances of the Church have given great

practical value to the question of a more general use of the Offertory as a means of maintaining and pronoting works of Piety and Charity. Do you think that this godly practice could be revived, and under what restrictions, and for what definite purposes ?

3. The Amended Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Bill.

4. What can be done by Bible or Communicant Classes, and by other means, to help those who have been Confirmed to lead consistent lives and to seek the Grace of God for that end ?

1863.

1. It is generally admitted that something is wanted to strengthen and utilise our Sunday Schools. What would secure these results ?

2. Can anything be done by the Church to provide for the wants of her Clergy, who, by age or infirmity, are disabled from supporting themselves ; and, if so, would such relief be best given by Pensions, or the establishment of Homes ?

3. The Order for the Burial of the Dead.

4. Subscriptions required of the Clergy.

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY.

When the Clergy allowed to Henry VIII. the title of *Supremum Caput*, they connected with it the qualifying words, “ *quantum per Christi legem licet* ;” and so, if we would ascertain the sense in which they conceded to the King the title, we must estimate aright the value of the qualification.—See Palmer on the Church, t. i., p. ii., c. iii., p. 461.

Moreover afterwards Queen Elizabeth substituted the title of Governor for that of Head.—See Burnet on Articles, Art. 37 ; and Burnet’s “ History of the Reformation,” t. iii., p. 773.

Mr. Gladstone, in his remarks on the Royal Supremacy, says, with regard to these two titles :—

“ An acknowledgment of the Headship of the Crown, qualified by the Law of Christ, by no means appears *ex vi terminorum* to imply the anuexation to it of a supreme jurisdiction in all ecclesiastical causes.”—P. 10.

“ Whatever inference might be drawn from the use of the word Head is more than destroyed by the more marked transition to the word Governor ; and the idea which that term conveys is of a negative, not a positive character ; it is that of a power which *corrects*, but does not *actuates*.”—P. 16.

And he thus summarises the effect of the statute 25 Henry VIII. :—“ The effect of the Statute, therefore, seems to be, that while *corrective* jurisdiction was secured in legal language to the temporal power, there was no distinct provision whatever made with respect to *directive* jurisdiction, that is to say, the ordinary authority by which the functions of the Church, when unobstructed by offence or dispute, are discharged.”—P. 11.







